

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Université d'Ottawa • University of Ottawa

**PATRIARCHY AND SELF-HATE:
MARY DALY'S PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF PATRIARCHAL RELIGION
APPRAISED AND CRITIQUED IN THE CONTEXT OF
KAREN HORNEY'S PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY**

By

© PAULA HOPE DURHAM

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-21967-4

DOCTORAL THESIS ABSTRACT FOR:

**PATRIARCHY AND SELF-HATE:
MARY DALY'S PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF PATRIARCHAL RELIGION
APPRAISED AND CRITIQUED IN THE CONTEXT OF
KAREN HORNEY'S PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY**

by

Paula Hope Durham

Mary Daly's psychological description of the pathology of patriarchal religion and her conclusions about the source of the pathology: misogyny, and its cure: Biophilic women's separatism, have received mixed reviews among scholars. In light of my research into the psychological theory of Karen Horney on the source, structure, and cure of psychological pathology, I find myself disagreeing with Daly's description of both cause and cure. Therefore, an evaluation of Daly's psychological theory in light of Horney's suggested itself. How would the hatred of women as the source of pathology stand up against Horney's theory of basic anxiety resulting in self-hate as pathology's source? How would Daly's biophilic separatism stand up as a cure over against Horney's view of health as imbued with wholeheartedness and compassion and a willingness to accept one's share of the blame?

Put simply, Daly's psychological paradigm is built on a view of patriarchy and patriarchal religion as misogynist to its very core, producing masochistically self-hating women and sadistic, misogynist self-hating men. The cure is for women to remove themselves physically but above all

psychically from patriarchal religions and all the institutions of patriarchy and to heal themselves in a biophilic community of women-only. Men who remain within any of the patriarchal institutions would be incurable. Men who leave patriarchal institutions behind would have to form their own separate community and heal themselves. Daly does not hold out much hope for the latter.

Karer: Horney's psychological paradigm, on the other hand, is built on a non-gendered view of pathology rooted in inadequate parenting that drives a person to abandon his or her real spontaneous, limited self in exchange for a false one that seems better suited to meet the exigencies of the immediate childhood situation. This abandonment of the real self is, for Horney, self-hate. From this move three *modi operandi* slowly emerge: the aggressive-vindictive, the compliant-morbidly dependent, and the detached-resigned. Each of these coping strategies moulds the false self into an idealized self while simultaneously crushing the real self. This idealized self arrogates to itself characteristics and privileges that belong to all, while projecting responsibilities and liabilities onto others that belong to all. The movement out of pathology toward health demands a deconstruction of the idealized self and an emerging acceptance of the real self with its shared privileges, responsibilities, good qualities and faults.

When these paradigms are put side-by-side, an interesting parallelism occurs. Daly's sadistic misogynist patriarchal male and Horney's aggressive-vindictive type have much in common. Daly's masochistically self-hating patriarchal woman and Horney's compliant-morbidly dependent type have many things in common with a significant difference in reference to personal responsibility. Daly's Biophilic, separatist woman has much in common with Horney's third pathological type, the detached-resigned type. In this thesis I will argue that the failures and

inadequacies of Daly's psychological paradigm are quite apparent when it is compared to Karen Horney's psychological paradigm. I will argue that Daly's conclusion that misogyny is the source of patriarchal pathology rather than a gender-free category like Horney's self-hate, leads her to a very one-sided psychological description of both men and women within patriarchy, and women within separatist Biophilic communities, and therefore that her conclusions regarding both the cause and cure of the pathology within patriarchy, religious or otherwise, need to be more carefully scrutinized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface.....	vi
Thesis Overview.....	ix
Chapter One: Mary Daly: Life, Influence and Themes in Her Work.....	1
1.1 A Brief Biographical Sketch.....	1
1.2 Daly's Influence.....	8
1.3 Overview of Themes in Daly's Work.....	13
a) Political Themes.....	13
i) World-wide Patriarchal Sexual Caste System.....	14
ii) Patriarchal Religion as the Embodiment and Perpetrator of the Sexual Caste System.....	18
iii) Misogyny as the Root Paradigm of Patriarchy.....	22
b) Philosophical Themes.....	24
i) Ontology.....	24
ii) Memory.....	34
iii) The Journey.....	35
iv) Naming.....	36
v) Transvaluation of Values.....	38
c) Psychological Themes.....	39

	Page
Chapter Two: Daly's Psychological Paradigm.....	40
2.1 Theologian, Philosopher and, or Psychologist?.....	40
2.2 Daly as Psychologist of Religion.....	43
2.3 Daly's Psychological Paradigm.....	46
a) The Sadistic Patriarchal Male.....	46
i) Nature of Women.....	47
ii) Nature and Role of Mary.....	49
iii) Nature and Role of God.....	52
iv) Ethical Teachings.....	55
v) Nature and Role of Rituals.....	57
vi) The Psychological Impact of the Church's Misogynist Teaching on Religious and Secular Society.....	59
b) The Masochistic Patriarchal Woman.....	67
c) The Biophilic Woman.....	71
Chapter Three: Karen Horney's Life, Influence and Psychological Paradigm.....	83
3.1 Karen Horney's Life and work.....	83
3.2 Horney's Influence.....	90
3.3 Horney's Psychological Paradigm.....	95
a) An Overview of the Development of Karen Horney's	

Psychological Theory.....	95
b) Further Reflections on Horney's Theory of Psychological Conflicts.....	101
c) Self-Hate.....	106
d) The Search for Glory.....	109
e) Horney's Psychological Typology.....	109
i) The Real Self.....	109
ii) The Idealized Self.....	110
iii) The Compliant-Morbidly Dependent Neurotic Solution.....	115
iv) The Aggressive-Vindictive Neurotic Solution.....	124
v) The Detached-Resigned Neurotic Solution.....	130
f) Resolving Neurotic Solutions.....	139
 Chapter Four: The Meshing and Clashing of Paradigms.....	147
4.1 The Patriarchal Male and the Aggressive-Vindictive Neurotic Solution.....	147
4.2 The Patriarchal Female and the Compliant-Morbidly Dependent Solution.....	150
i) The Principle Descriptors.....	152
ii) The Secondary Descriptors.....	155

	Page
iii) The Occasional Descriptors.....	156
iv) The Exoneration of the Patriarchal Female.....	158
4.3 The Biophilic Woman and the Detached-Resigned Neurotic	
Solution.....	160
a) The Magic Circle and its Concomitant Parts.....	162
i) The Magic Circle.....	162
ii) The Idealized Self and the Search for Glory.....	164
iii) The Integrity of the Detached-Resigned Type.....	169
b) Further Aspects of the Magic Circle.....	171
4.4 The Resolution of the Meshing and Clashing of Paradigms.....	172
Chapter Five: Reflection and Conclusion.....	176
5.1 Supportive Critique.....	177
5.2 Negative Critique.....	181
Conclusion.....	195
Bibliography.....	198

PREFACE

Mary Daly's psychological description of the pathology of patriarchal religion and her conclusions about the source of the pathology: misogyny, and its cure: Biophilic women's separatism, have received mixed reviews among scholars. In light of my research into the psychological theory of Karen Horney on the source, structure, and cure of psychological pathology, I find myself disagreeing with Daly's description of both cause and cure. Therefore, an evaluation of Daly's psychological theory in light of Horney's suggested itself. How would the hatred of women as the source of pathology stand up against Horney's theory of basic anxiety resulting in self-hate as pathology's source? How would Daly's biophilic separatism stand up as a cure over against Horney's view of health as imbued with wholeheartedness and compassion and a willingness to accept one's share of the blame?

Put simply, Daly's psychological paradigm is built on a view of patriarchy and patriarchal religion as misogynist to its very core, producing masochistically self-hating women and sadistic, misogynist self-hating men. The cure is for women to remove themselves physically but above all psychically from patriarchal religions and all the institutions of patriarchy and to heal themselves in a biophilic community of women-only. Men who remain within any of the patriarchal institutions would be incurable. Men who leave patriarchal institutions behind would have to form their own separate community and heal themselves. Daly does not hold out much hope for the latter.

Karen Horney's psychological paradigm, on the other hand, is built on a non-gendered view of pathology rooted in inadequate parenting that drives a person to abandon his or her real spontaneous, limited self in exchange for a false one that seems better suited to meet the

exigencies of the immediate childhood situation. This abandonment of the real self is, for Horney, self-hate. From this move three *modi operandi* slowly emerge: the aggressive-vindictive, the compliant-morbidly dependent, and the detached-resigned. Each of these coping strategies moulds the false self into an idealized self while simultaneously crushing the real self. This idealized self arrogates to itself characteristics and privileges that belong to all, while projecting responsibilities and liabilities onto others that belong to all. The movement out of pathology toward health demands a deconstruction of the idealized self and an emerging acceptance of the real self with its shared privileges, responsibilities, good qualities and faults.

When these paradigms are put side-by-side, an interesting parallelism occurs. Daly's sadistic misogynist patriarchal male and Horney's aggressive-vindictive type have much in common. Daly's masochistically self-hating patriarchal woman and Horney's compliant-morbidly dependent type have many things in common with a significant difference in reference to personal responsibility. Daly's Biophilic, separatist woman has much in common with Horney's third pathological type, the detached-resigned type. In this thesis I will argue that the failures and inadequacies of Daly's psychological paradigm are quite apparent when it is compared to Karen Horney's psychological paradigm. I will argue that Daly's conclusion that misogyny is the source of patriarchal pathology rather than a gender-free category like Horney's self-hate, leads her to a very one-sided psychological description of both men and women within patriarchy, and women within separatist Biophilic communities, and therefore that her conclusions regarding both the cause and cure of the pathology within patriarchy, religious or otherwise, need to be more carefully scrutinized.

There has been a great deal of commentary on Mary Daly's work in articles and theses. Most articles are critical of Daly's work, while the dissertations, in equal numbers, tend to both promote and critique Daly. Susan E. Henking, in her article, "Rejected, Reclaimed, Renamed: Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion"¹ has critiqued Daly's use of psychological language and categories to present both the problems of women in patriarchal religion and the solution to these problems. I will extend this critique of Daly's use of psychological language and concept, critiquing in particular, the psychologically pathological nature of her description of problems and solutions to the psychological problems within patriarchal religion.

Feminist scholars are beginning to acknowledge the contribution that Karen Horney has made to an understanding of women's psychology. Nancy J. Chodorow states that the political and theoretical origins of psychoanalytic feminism are located in Karen Horney's work even though her theories had been ignored in mainstream psychoanalysis during her lifetime.² I wish to extend this acknowledgement of Horney's contribution by showing how the application of her psychoanalytic theory can be used to evaluate and critique the psychological feminism of a scholar such as Mary Daly.

By way of methodology I will use Karen Horney's psychological paradigm of human pathology, which includes a description of pathology's roots, characteristics, and resolution to compare and contrast, evaluate and critique Mary Daly's psychological paradigm of human pathology which also includes a description of roots, characteristics and resolution. Secondary sources will be used to place this presentation of paradigms and my conclusions about them in a

¹ Susan E. Henking, "Rejected, Reclaimed, Renamed: Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion," *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 21, 3 (1993), pp. 199-207.

² Nancy J. Chodorow, *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 3

critical context. In so doing I hope to bring Karen Horney's work about gender and pathology to the current analysis of gender taking place in feminist studies of religion. Horney's work can, I believe, help create a more gender friendly space in which further discussion can take place. It is important to note three structural limitations to the analysis presented in the thesis. The first is that Daly's psychological paradigm is being compared only to Karen Horney's because Karen Horney is the only creator of a psychological paradigm that posits self-hate- the refusal to be one's everyday, spontaneous, limited self- as the root of psychological pathology. The second is that the only aspect of Daly's work that I am comparing to Karen's Horney's is the psychological aspect. Finally, the thesis is meant to be a critique of the psychological thinking embedded in Daly's ideology: a critique of Karen Horney's work is outside of the scope of this thesis.

THESIS OVERVIEW: THE UNIFYING THREADS³

Chapter One gives an overview of Daly's life, the influence of her work and the main political and philosophical themes of her work. What is especially important for this thesis is Daly's declaration that misogyny is the root paradigm for patriarchal evil as well as her ontological reflections about patriarchal male and Biophilic women's being.

Chapter Two presents Daly's psychological paradigm. This paradigm is built on her ontological beliefs about male and female being and her political belief that misogyny is the root paradigm of all patriarchal evil.

Chapter Three is a presentation of Horney's psychological paradigm. The underlying ontology is found in her description of the real self and the various neurotic expressions of the

³ Throughout the thesis I follow Daly's spelling and capitalization when I am using the words to present her theory. When I am presenting Horney's theory I follow her use of the pronoun 'he'.

false self. For Horney the root paradigm of pathology is self-hate, a category that remains at the psychological level in her writing.

Chapter Four focuses on the points of convergence and divergence in the two psychological paradigms. It is here that the differences in ontology and the etiology of psychological pathology clearly determine the viability of Daly and Horney's positions.

Chapter Five reflects on the thesis argument that Daly's psychological paradigm is insufficient to the task of describing psychological pathology, psychological health or the etiology of psychological pathology. This reflection is carried out through a review of the critique of Daly's work. The chapter concludes with a brief summary statement of the thesis argument and an appeal for the consideration of the usefulness of Karen Horney's work in the ongoing effort to sort out the difficulties between the sexes.

CHAPTER ONE: MARY DALY: LIFE, INFLUENCE, AND THEMES IN HER WORK

1.1 A Brief Biographical Sketch¹

Mary Daly was born in Schenectady, New York, in 1929, the only child of Frank and Anna Daly. Anna Daly was thirty-eight when Mary was born. From the beginning Daly says that she and her mother had a very special relationship. Daly was frequently absent from her elementary school classes with the permission of her mother: "Times of flying free, which gave me an enduring Taste for escaping imposed routines... I think that my mother, co-conspirator that she was, realized this."² Sporadic efforts to conform at this level, later gave way to an "insufferable stubbornness - a quality which never failed me."³ Daly claims to have been "at least fifty per cent oblivious to society's expectations... and one hundred per cent resistant to whatever expectations [I] did not manage to avoid noticing."⁴ Daly never wanted to marry or have children or change her name. She credits her mother with never suggesting that she do any of these, as well as for the "rock bottom self-confidence and Sense of Direction which, even in the bleakest periods, have never entirely deserted [me]."⁵

Daly believes that the most important thing that she learned in high school was that the male claim to superiority was utterly false. She writes, "What I could not understand was how

¹ The main source for this section is Mary Daly's autobiographical-text, *Outercourse: The Be-Dazzling Journey, Containing Recollections From My "Logbook of a Radical Feminist Philosopher" (Be-ing an Account of my Time/Space Travels and Ideas- Then, Again, Now and How)* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992). This text is usually referred to simply as, *Outercourse*. In this book Daly might be said to give the preferred version of her life story and the preferred interpretation of her work. See Carol J. Adams, "Mary, Mary Quite Contrary," *Women's Review of Books* (March, 1993) pages 1 and 3, for a comprehensive review of this text, and its place in the context of Mary Daly's life and thought.

² *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

anyone could possibly believe such outrageous propaganda.”⁶ During this time she also had one of her early metaphysical encounters with the elements of nature, which began her “Taboo-breaking Quest- to be a philosopher.”⁷

At St. Rose College, Daly found herself marginalized both by class and difference of interests. She was not after her ‘Mrs.’ and looking back she saw this as the beginning of what later would become ‘Boundary Living.’ She earned a Master’s Degree in English at Catholic University of America taking philosophy courses on the side. Daly then went to St. Mary’s, Notre Dame, Indiana where she completed, at age twenty-five, a Doctorate in Religious Studies and was, during her time there, introduced by her Dominican professors to Thomas Aquinas and the ‘philosophical *habitus*.’ The University of Notre Dame refused her application for a Doctorate in Philosophy because she was a woman, and later did not even respond to her application to do a doctorate in theology. After four years of teaching theology and philosophy at Cardinal Cushing College, she applied to do a doctorate in theology at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland where government ownership disallowed refusal on the basis of gender. After a teaching stint at the University of Ottawa in the summer of 1959, she headed to Switzerland.

At the University of Fribourg, Daly studied in Latin, taking, she said, what was useful from her studies and discarding what was not, all the while training her mind. With regard to her later publications, Daly writes, “All of these books have drawn upon the athleticism of the mind that I learned then - a kind of intellectual karate.”⁸ Daly travelled widely while in Europe, and

⁶ Ibid., p. 36.

⁷ Ibid., p. 41. Some other metaphysical experiences of this elemental intuition of being are “the big gleaming block of ice in the snow” (pages 23, 26-27) ‘The Timer’, the little green man in her head (p. 47), the green hedge that spoke to her of continued existence after death (p. 51), “the ‘celestial light’ over meadows and the transcendent purple of the sky,” (P. 114), and the tornado at Levrett in 1980 (pp. 251-252).

⁸ Ibid., p. 59.

returned there and to Great Britain, often to Ireland, in the ensuing years. Her mother, whose health was declining, joined her in Fribourg in 1962, an event that she describes as a happy reunion for them both, and a reminder to her of her immensely happy childhood. Daly completed her Doctorate in Theology in 1963. The theme of her thesis was a “Passionate defence of the life of the mind...”⁹ There was a momentary glitch regarding the obligation to take the Anti-Modernist Oath, but she was saved by being denied the opportunity- because she was a woman! Undaunted, Daly enrolled for the Doctorate in Philosophy in the fall of 1963. From both degrees she credits learning how to disclose the deceptions of the medieval masters that she studied. She saw achieving the Doctorate of Philosophy as both a “rite of passage” and a “Right of Passage” to reclaim what had been stolen from women. “That is, it was a patriarchal professional legitimization for my absolutely Anti-patriarchal, Unprofessional career of seeking and Dis-covering lost/stolen knowledge and of Re-membering my own Lost Senses and Lost Senses of words. In other words, it was a momentous Moment on my Voyage of becoming a Radical Feminist Philosopher.”¹⁰ Daly finished this final doctorate in July, 1965. She was directed to leave the country by the government of Switzerland a year later because she no longer had legitimate business there. This required her to return to the United States and search for work. Fatefully, it seems, out of the many opportunities with which she was presented, she chose to teach at Boston College.

At this time Daly reports awakening to her own calling to be a writer. The catalyst for this awakening was Rosemary Lauer’s article in *Commonweal* in December of 1963, “Women and the Church,” that argues for women’s equality within the Church. She responded to that article

⁹ Ibid., p. 69.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 78.

with one of her own also printed in *Commonweal* in January 1965, titled "A Built-in Bias." The article led to the invitation from Geoffrey Chapman Ltd. to write a book, later published as *The Church and the Second Sex*.¹¹ The hope for reform expressed in this book was inspired, at least in part, by her visit to Rome in the fall of 1965 when the Second Vatican Council was in session.

Once at Boston College Daly felt the full force of her status as a token woman. Three doctorates failed to earn her the courtesy of being introduced as Dr. Daly. *The Church and the Second Sex* came out in the winter of 1968. In the winter of 1969 Boston College responded by giving her a one year terminal contract, the equivalent of being fired. Her cause was taken up by the students at the college, and quite unexpectedly, in Daly's view, the college not only reversed its decision, but granted her tenure. This was also the beginning of a protracted war with the administration of Boston College.¹² In the fall of 1969 this conflict took the form of small classes because students at enrolment time were being intimidated into not enrolling in her classes. Her decision to speak at a pro-choice rally in the fall of 1970, and perhaps also her public linking of the destruction of the environment with the treatment of women in patriarchy, further alienated her from her Boston College colleagues.

In 1971, Daly responded to what she called Peter Berger's "aggressive will not to know." She writes, "I gained the insight, never to be forgotten, that one could write a lucid book [*The Sacred Canopy*]... while still refusing to acknowledge its logical implications. Berger's abstract

¹¹ Mary Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, 3rd. ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985). Daly published a number of articles between 1965 and 1975. From then on, aside from excerpts reprinted from her books and interviews, her books become the main and almost only source of published work.

¹² This "war" took many forms: obstruction by colleagues, refusal of promotion, monitoring classes, harassing letters, and minimal salary increments. As for the initial skirmish, Michael Malec, a sociology professor at Boston College at the time, writes that part of the problem was the antiquated promotion and tenure process. He speculates that older Jesuits were offended by Daly's writings, and that with the exception of Daly's courses, other compulsory theology courses were hated by the students. See: Michael Malec, "Incident at Boston College: Phasing Out Mary Daly," *Commonweal* (April 4, 1969), pp. 61-62.

theory was split off from insight into the realities that I experienced every day of my life.”¹³ In later writings Daly frequently points to scholarship whose value is marred by its failure to take into account the patriarchal structure of society and how it impacts on women’s lives.¹⁴ Also that year, Daly was invited to be the first woman to preach at a Sunday service at Harvard Memorial Church. Daly decided to make it even more memorable by inviting all those alienated by patriarchal religion to join her in leaving the patriarchal church behind. Hundreds of women and some men left with her.¹⁵

In 1972 Daly came to terms with her sexual orientation as a lesbian, and her inability to remain a Christian. She also began to write *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*¹⁶ which she completed in January of the next year. Once again there was a backlash at Boston College, this time from the senior faculty of the theology department who declared in her presence that the department lacked anyone doing anything in philosophy.

During the summer of 1974 Daly wrote her autobiographical preface and the postchristian introduction for the reissuing of *The Church and the Second Sex* which was due out in 1975. That fall she applied for promotion to the rank of full professor, which was subsequently denied in February of 1975 on the grounds that she had made no significant contribution to the field and had only written popular theology. There was a gathering of feminists from all over the United States on February 27, 1975 to protest Daly’s failure to be promoted. Of the denial of promotion,

¹³ Ibid., p. 135. Daly wrote Berger after having read *The Sacred Canopy* to tell him how impressed she was with his book and how it had inspired some of her own thinking in *Beyond God the Father*. He replied that he was not interested in women’s liberation. She replied to his invitation to visit him in New York, where Daly surmised he would try to set her straight, by inviting him to visit her at her office in Boston.

¹⁴ See *Pure Lust*, pp. 355-365 for several examples.

¹⁵ Daly, *Outercourse*, p. 138.

¹⁶ Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985).

Daly wrote, "I knew then, fully, that my scholarship and originality would never be adequately rewarded within the 'system,' ..." ¹⁷

In the fall of 1975 Daly began a three year unpaid leave of absence to write *Gyn/Ecology* ¹⁸ which was published in December 1978. She reports that she "was in a special mode of creative consciousness" while writing *Gyn/Ecology*, "sparked by a will to overcome all phallogratically imposed fears..." ¹⁹ A Metalanguage was being created in league with other women who were trying to "break through the silence and sounds of phallogratic babble." ²⁰ In January of 1979 the administration of Boston College stepped up its harassment by sending in observers to her classes who subsequently filed complaints of harassment. By February there were monitors in all her classes. Daly dealt with this by having round table seminars in which the monitors were obliged to sit. She also invited the local press. The administration withdrew within two weeks, and punished her by giving her minimal increments from then on. In April of 1979 there was a rally to protest patriarchal education in general and its effort to silence Daly in particular.

During the summer of 1980 Daly began writing *Pure Lust*. ²¹ She saw the 1980's as backlash years, sensing that "the world was growing colder, more hostile, more life-hating and woman-hating." ²² She began another period of leave from Boston College and did not return until the fall of 1983. *Pure Lust* was published in June, 1984. In the interim she faced further harassment from the administration in March of 1982. In light of distorted reports of a lecture she had given at the University of Wisconsin at LaCrosse, she was accused of blasphemy and thus of

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 208.

¹⁸ Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, 2nd. ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990).

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 213.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 213.

²¹ Mary Daly, *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1984).

²² Ibid., p. 243.

being in violation of her contractual obligations. Daly tried to defend herself to no avail. Her punishment for this unsubstantiated charge was a zero salary increment for the year 1983-84. While lecturing in Cork, Ireland during the summer of 1984, she was asked why she bothered staying at Boston College. Her answer would seem to be tied up with her own sense of purpose and integrity. Daly said she was

choosing to Fight/Act (Stand my Ground) at that precise location in the Boundary between Background and foreground where the demonic patriarchal distortions of women's archaic heritage are most visible and accessible to me, where my Craft can be most effective in the work of Exorcism- reversing the reversals that blunt the potential for Realizing Ecstasy.²³

As part of her reflections on *Outercourse* Daly notes that she solved her inner struggle about the conflict between theology and philosophy by writing *Pure Lust*: "In writing *Pure Lust* I realized my deepest choice: to *be* a philosopher... I did not merely choose the latter over the former; I engulfed both in my Elemental Feminist Philosophy. Rejecting the idea of a supernatural order and authority which purportedly transcends nature, I chose to follow my Quest for autonomous knowing."²⁴ And in defence of creating a language of her own, she writes,

Pure Lust is a Taboo-breaker on many levels. By assuming theology into my own Elementary Feminist Philosophy, decoding its symbols, reversing its reversals, I have challenged directly the authority of the male god in all his guises. By combining the abstract and even seemingly elitist vocabulary of ontology with wild, Elemental words I have broken taboos against proper linguistic behavior.²⁵

In the only such revelation in her text, Daly admits to snapping back at a questioner, in Dublin, Ireland in July 1987, who was upset with "what she perceived as my 'hostility' toward men. I was impatient with her and snapped back."²⁶ Daly reports getting some bad press over

²³ Ibid., p. 284.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 324.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 326.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 351. I have been told that Daly's impatience with questioners is a frequent feature of her presentations.

this but being supported by the vast majority of those other women present at the lecture. Daly underlined that throughout her travels both working class and educated women attended her lectures. She also reported that most of her presentations were very well received.

In March of 1984 she and Jane Caputi agreed to work together on the *Wickedary*.²⁷ In February 1985 there was further harassment by the administration about the response to a lecture she had given in Chicago at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion. There was the usual round of letters. Daly suggested that the Dean read *Pure Lust* in order to see for himself that the blasphemy charges were unfounded. Daly and Caputi worked together on the *Wickedary* from the spring of 1985 to June 1986 when the first draft was completed. She and Emily Culpepper finished the text during the next academic year, and the book was published in the fall of 1987. Meanwhile in June of 1987 she had started writing *Outercourse* in response to suggestions that she tell her story and explain how she had arrived at her conclusions. This book was published in the fall of 1992.

During 1988-89 Daly spoke at several universities. She also created the event she calls "The Witches Return." Daly observed upon her return to Boston College in the fall of 1988 that the students were increasingly more conservative. She also felt that Boston College was using her name to present themselves as a liberal institution without giving her any compensation, in terms of promotion to full professor and the increased income that would come with such a promotion. She applied for promotion again in October of 1988 and was turned down again in February of 1989. When Daly appealed her denial of promotion, she was again told that her work was not considered to be scholarly. There were five 'events' in March and April to protest the refusal of

²⁷ Mary Daly and Jane Caputi, *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987).

promotion. These events ranged from a march on the president's office to a read-in of Daly's books in the theology department.²⁸ The decision was not reversed but Daly felt that at least the fraudulent use of her name by Boston College to gain students and acclaim, was exposed, thanks to the "excellent media coverage."²⁹ The "Witches Return" celebrated on Mother's Day, 1989 was the final response to the university's failure to promote her and to all the prevailing patriarchal ills. She writes,

So in 1989, in the foreground Age of Dis-memberment, we Leaped into participation in Nemesis. We - the Witches - returned to judge and mete out the death punishment to the gynocidal killers of women's minds, bodies, and spirits... The Witches of Boston have pronounced them GUILTY - without qualification.³⁰

Since her return to Boston College from her leave to finish writing *Outercourse* in the fall of 1992 there has been no further published word from her.

1.2 Daly's Influence

Daly's work has had a global impact on the self-image of women and their understanding of the social order. Some women have experienced the social order that Daly labels "planetary patriarchy" as impaling them on the will of men. This influence has also been felt in the academy, particularly in feminist theology and women's studies. This brief overview of her influence will have two foci: her influence directly within theological circles, and her influence outside those circles. The articulation of this influence took place largely in the two previous decades during Daly's most productive period of writing.

Daly is often described in terms that suggest there is a prophetic, catalytic, and or cathartic dynamic to her influence within theological circles. Carl Raschke compares Daly to Nietzsche,

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 390-392.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 393.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 398.

seeing both as having “prophetic acumen as to the temper of [their] age.”³¹ Carter Heyward finds it ironic that Daly’s prophetic voice is sounded outside of the tradition she could most influence,³² and yet, like Ruth Evans, she believes that Daly’s contribution is vital both to the world and to the Church.³³ Mary Ann Stenger concedes that Daly has challenged contemporary theology to move beyond sexism and the patriarchal viewpoint.³⁴ David Shields realizes that Daly has articulated poignantly women’s dissatisfaction with a male saviour and their having to bear the brunt of original sin, positions he believes are “shared by a broad range of feminist religious scholars.”³⁵ Rosemary Radford Ruether acknowledges Daly’s importance in confronting women with the painful necessity of facing sexist religion.³⁶ Renate Rieger points out that while Daly’s post-Christian position is not represented among published German women theologians, they have learned a great deal from her. “They have found in [*Beyond God the Father*] the articulation of their discomfit, questions, anger, and also part of their hopes. Daly has given them the courage to ask the questions that women had previously not dared to ask.”³⁷ On the other hand, Daly has a large following among non-professional women who are interested in theology and religion. Although other American feminists are read, Daly has had the greatest impact. Joan Engelsman cautions that readers should approach Daly’s work with common sense and good judgement, but that nonetheless Daly is one of the most significant modern theologians, adding that her language is no worse than Heidegger’s - probably better because it is based in the English language.³⁸

Susannah Heschel in her article “Current Issues in Jewish Feminist Theology” begins by writing:

³¹ Carl Raschke, “The Death of God the Father,” *Iliff Review* 35 (Spring, 1978), p. 55.

³² Carter Heyward, “Speaking and Sparking, Building and Burning,” *Christianity and Crisis* 39, 5 (1979), p. 72.

³³ Ruth Evans, “Woman as Other: A Study of Alienation in Rosemary Ruether, Mary Daly and Sheila Collins” (master’s thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1980), p. 116.

³⁴ Mary Ann Stenger, “A Critical Analysis of the Influence of Paul Tillich on Mary Daly’s Feminist Theology,” *Encounter* 43, 3 (1982), p. 235.

³⁵ David L. Shields, “Christ: A Male Feminist View,” *Encounter* 45 (1984), p. 222.

³⁶ Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983), p. 187.

³⁷ Renate Rieger, “Half of Heaven Belongs to Women and They Must Win It for Themselves: An Attempt at a Feminist Theological Stock-Taking in the Federal Republic of Germany,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 1, 1 (1985), p. 140.

³⁸ Joan Chamberlain Engelsman, “Patterns in Christian Feminism; A Bibliographic Essay,” *The Drew Gateway* 56, 1 (1985), pp. 1-15.

"The growth in recent years of the feminist critique of religion can best be traced through the writings of Mary Daly, the acknowledged trail-blazer in feminist theory."³⁹ Sarah Chappell Trulove and James Woefel conclude, "Without any question, Mary Daly is the pre-eminent neo-pagan feminist and, with Ruether, the other 'genius' of American feminist theologians."⁴⁰ They also see Daly as the global "leader and visionary of radical feminism."⁴¹ and as one who stands apart from the American Academy of Religion as the one who must be critiqued, as she declines to respond to the Academy's critique. Amanda Porterfield sees Daly as the "premier prophet of Goddess religion."⁴² She notes that Daly has the oracular style of the prophet, that "her writings have exerted enormous influence among a wide variety of feminist theologians."⁴³ Wanda Warren Berry observes that many feminist theologians "no longer identify with Daly in the current development of her position; but most are either consciously grateful for her painful pioneering of the movement or they are unconsciously dependent upon her analyses and phrases."⁴⁴ Carol Jablonski notes that "After Daly, Catholic reformers could not escape noticing the rhetorical bind they were in: to the extent that they defined themselves and their cause in the language and arguments traditionally associated with Christianity, they would not be able to overcome their 'secondary' status in the Church."⁴⁵ Linda Olds compares Daly with Hildegard of Bingen. She writes, "An understanding of Hildegard of Bingen and Mary Daly would not be complete without noting their fundamental role as prophets for their times, and the ethical import of their writings and central ecological themes that have caught the eye of those concerned with

³⁹ Susannah Heschel, "Current Issues in Jewish Feminist Theology," *Christian Jewish Relations* 19, 2 (1986), p. 24.

⁴⁰ Sarah Chappell Trulove and James Woefel, "The Feminist Re-Formation of American Religious Thought," in *Religion and Philosophy in the U.S.A.*, ed. Peter Freese (Essen: Verlag Die Blaue Eule, 1987), 2:p. 745.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 745.

⁴² Amanda Porterfield, "Feminist Theology as Revitalization Movement," *Sociological Analysis* 48 (1987), p. 237.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁴⁴ Wanda Warren Berry, "Feminist Theology: The 'Verbing' of Ultimate/Intimate Reality in Mary Daly," *Ultimate Reality* 11 (1988), p. 212.

⁴⁵ Carol J. Jablonski, "Rhetoric, Paradox, and the Movement for Women's Ordination in the Roman Catholic Church," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (1988), p. 167.

global survival today.”⁴⁶ Ann Loades puts it yet another way: “If Elizabeth Cady Stanton is the doyenne of the nineteenth-century movement of feminist theology, Mary Daly is the doyenne of the twentieth-century one.”⁴⁷ Beverly Wildung Harrison writes that,

Among the many debts we owe Mary Daly is this: She has described the problem in an uncompromising way and has made it impossible for any intellectually honest person to deny the necessity of a feminist critique of Christianity... It would be a form of deep intellectual dishonesty not to acknowledge that only Mary Daly’s profound rage has produced a feminist critique strong enough to assure that some minimal attention must be given [misogyny] within ecclesiastical and academic circles.⁴⁸

Daphne Hampson views Daly’s work as eschatological, visionary, and utopian, all of which makes it effective politically. Hampson believes that radical feminism needs a vision in order to survive and in order to understand itself, and feminism needs radical feminism to be its conscience, and Daly serves both these needs.⁴⁹

In areas less connected or not connected to theology, Daly’s influences seem pre-eminently catalytic. Ross Kraemer finds Daly’s work provocative, frightening, poetic and compelling; self-consciously radical in language and structure; having a sustained analysis of the pervasive interconnections between phallocratic society and religion, and being the most systematic challenge to feminist religious reformers.⁵⁰ Marilyn Frye sees Daly as working to create new meaning for women, and she believes that there is much to be learned from the methods Daly uses to create this new meaning. Also she sees Daly as providing a valuable education in Western intellectual history.⁵¹ Vivian Harrower describes Daly as a church reformer, patriarchal culture transformer, metamorphosizer of women’s consciousness and creator of

⁴⁶ Linda E. Olds, “Metaphors of Hierarchy and Interrelatedness in Hildegard of Bingen and Mary Daly,” *Listening* 24 (1989), p. 61.

⁴⁷ Ann Loades, “The Virgin Mary and the Feminist Quest,” in *After Eve*, ed. Janet Martin Soskice (London: Collins, 1990), p. 162.

⁴⁸ Beverly Wildung Harrison, “The Power of Anger in the Work of Love: Christian Ethics for Women and Other Strangers,” in *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, ed. Ann Loades (London: SPCK, 1990), pp. 196-197.

⁴⁹ Daphne Hampson, *Theology and Feminism* (Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990), pp. 143-144.

⁵⁰ Ross S. Kraemer, review of *Gyn/Ecology*, by Mary Daly, *Signs* (Winter 1979), p. 356.

⁵¹ Marilyn Frye, “Famous Lust Words,” *The Women’s Review of Books* 1, 1 (1984), pp. 3-4.

women's culture.⁵² Mary M. Maher believes that Daly's work is important to the process of women's therapy; that the shock of Daly's feminist philosophy heals, allowing women to confront their own internalized oppression.⁵³ Carolyn Moulton describes the Daly of *Pure Lust* as playful, zealous, and visionary, one of the first women to attempt to break away from the traditional language structures. The title, she believes, "names the problem and the way out."⁵⁴ Jill Vickers points to Daly's influence on feminist methodology.⁵⁵ Julia Penelope compares Daly's achievement in the *Wickedary* to Gertrude Stein's in "dis-covered language that is purposefully, radically unsettling."⁵⁶ Zulma Nelly Martinez believes that Daly's writings on the nature of reality and language have contributed invaluable to the development of the holographic paradigm in feminist fiction writing.⁵⁷ Judith Halberstam believes that *Gyn/Ecology* is "perhaps the most important work in the cultural feminist tradition, imaginatively and yet reductively perform[ing] an unequivocal rejection of all technologies."⁵⁸ Carol Adams, in her 1993 review of *Outercourse*, gives an overview of Daly's career that sums up, rather succinctly, the catalytic nature of Daly's influence.

Mary Daly's life is about Be-ing; she has challenged *aphasia* with Naming, *amnesia* with Knowing, *apraxia* with Acting. As a radical feminist philosopher she provides an analysis of ontology - what smashes female Be-ing in a patriarchal world and what enables it. From the moment in the 1970s when she realized the women's liberation movement was an ontological movement, in which women participate in their own becoming and being, she has, labrys-like, both named it and pushed it further.⁵⁹

⁵² Vivian Jarrett Harrower, "Feminist Critiques of a Male Saviour: Christology in the Writings of Mary Daly and Rosemary Ruether" (master's thesis, University of St. Michael's College, 1985), p.7.

⁵³ Mary M. Maher, review of *Pure Lust* by Mary Daly, *Women & Therapy* 4 (Summer 1985), pp. 76-78.

⁵⁴ Carolyn Moulton, "Spooking the Snools: Scriptures According to Daly," *Broadside* 6, 3 (1995), p. 10.

⁵⁵ Jill McCalla Vickers, "Memoirs of an Ontological Exile: The Methodological Rebellions of Feminist Research," in *Feminism: From Pressure to Politics*, ed. Angela Miles and Geraldine Fim (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1989), pp. 37-56.

⁵⁶ Julia Penelope, "Erratic, Ecstatic, Eccentric," *The Women's Review of Books* 5, 3 (1987), p. 5.

⁵⁷ Zulma Nelly Martinez, "From a Mimetic to a Holographic Paradigm in Fiction: Toward a Definition of Feminist Writing," *Women's Studies* 14 (1988), p. 225

⁵⁸ Judith Halberstam, "Automating Gender: Postmodern Feminism in the Age of the Intelligent Machine," *Feminist Studies* 17, 3 (1991), p. 450.

⁵⁹ Carol J. Adams, "Mary, Mary, Quite Contrary," p. 3.

1.3 Overview of Themes in Daly's Work⁶⁰

One way to approach a general overview of the themes in Mary Daly's work is to focus on the political, philosophical, and psychological elements of her ideas. Political, in Daly's case, means looking at the ways Daly analyses patriarchal religion and patriarchal society as ideological expressions of the oppression of women and nature and how women might respond to these ideological constructions. Philosophical themes centre around ontology and metaphor. Psychological themes focus on sadism, masochism, and a prescription for moving beyond these pathologies.⁶¹ The primary sources for this survey of themes in Daly's work are *Beyond God the Father*, *Gyn/Ecology*, and *Pure Lust*. In *Beyond God the Father* Daly sets out her agenda for the period between 1973 and 1984. It presents those aspects of her thinking that she chooses to keep since she began writing in 1965. The texts after *Pure Lust* (*Wickedary* and *Outercourse*) do not present any substantial changes in what Daly has already proposed.

a) Political Themes⁶²

⁶⁰ See Jacqueline Field-Bibb, "From *The Church to Wickedary*: The Theology and Philosophy of Mary Daly," *Modern Churchman* 30, 4 (1989), pp. 35-41 for a succinct review of themes in Daly's work.

⁶¹ For some general comments about the *ad hominem* nature of some of Daly's arguments or their derivativeness, her reliance on her own intuition and her use of language, see John E. Burkhardt, "Mary Daly: Theological Orphan?" *Horizons* 2 (1975), pp. 119-120; Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Why Not a Category of Friend/Friendship?" *Horizons* 2 (1975), pp. 117-118; Christine G. Allen, "Self-creation and Loss: Mary Daly and St. Teresa of Avila," *Religious Studies* 6, 1 (1976), pp. 67-72; Michael Berenbaum, "Women, Blacks and Jews: Theologians of Survival," *Religion and Life* 45 (1976), pp. 106-118; G. McLeod Bryan, "Does Feminist Theology Liberate?" *Foundations* 19 (January-March 1976), pp. 40-49; Vicky Cosstick, "Meet Mary Daly, Feminist Philosopher," *Kinesis* (April-May 1979), pp. 3-4; Rita M. Gross, "Bitterness and Effectiveness: Reflections on Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*," *Anima* 7 (1980), pp. 47-51; Ann-Janine Morey-Gaines, "Metaphor and Radical Feminism: Some Cautionary Comments on Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*," *Soundings* 65, 3 (1982), pp. 340-351; Stenger, "A Critical Analysis of the Influence of Paul Tillich on Mary Daly's Feminist Theology," pp. 219-238; Kathleen Martindale, review of *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy* by Mary Daly, *RFR/DRF* 13, 3 (1984), pp. 54-55; Janet Smith, Mary F. Rousseau, Phyllis Sagano, Joyce A. Little, Richard J. Roach, S.J., "Mary Daly's *Pure Lust*: A Symposium," *Catholicism in Crisis* (October 1984), pp. 33-42; Engelsman, pp. 1-15.

⁶² For commentary on Daly's political position as presented in this section, see: Michael Berenbaum, "Women, Blacks and Jews: Theologians of Survival," pp. 106-118; Carol P. Christ, "The New Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature," *Religious Studies Review*, pp. 3,4 (October 1977), pp. 203-206; John B. Cobb, Jr., "Response to Mary Daly," in *John Cobb's Theology in Process*, ed. David R. Griffin and Thomas J.J. Altizer (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977), pp. 84-98; Wanda Warren Berry, "Images of Sin and Salvation in Feminist Theology," *Anglican Theological Review* 60, 1 (1978), pp. 25-54; Margaret A. Simons, "Racism and Feminism: A Schism in the Sisterhood," *Feminist Studies* 5, 2 (1979), pp. 384-396; Marjorie Suchocki, "The

For those who consider Mary Daly a theologian, subsuming her theological critique under the umbrella of politics may seem strange. However, Daly does not see herself as a theologian, and she understands the theology of patriarchal religion as ideology, and in the case of Christianity, an ideology that has been taken over by the contemporary secular patriarchy of the West. I will examine Daly's political reflections under the headings of i) patriarchy as a world wide sexual caste system, ii) patriarchal religion as the embodiment and perpetrator of sexual caste, and iii) misogyny as the root paradigm of patriarchy.

i) World Wide Patriarchal Sexual Caste System

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly describes many aspects of the sexual caste system. Patriarchy exploits cultural sex role socialization as carried out by parents and teachers. It uses sex role segregation to disguise the exploitation and the derivative status given women. These women are told that they are equal but different,⁶³ and their achievements are trivialized and hidden.⁶⁴ The resulting sexual stereotypes polarize human qualities.⁶⁵ This is reinforced by a system of communication, symbolic and linguistic, that is created by men for men,⁶⁶ and that

Challenge of Mary Daly," *Encounter* 41, 4 (1980), pp. 307-317; Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, p. 187ff.; Susan Everson, "Bodyself: Women's Bodily Experience in Recent Feminist Theology and Women's Literature" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1984), pp. 124-126; Elizabeth Shüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 22-28; Martindale, pp. 54-55; Harrower, p. 23ff.; Mary Ann Stenger, "Male Over Female, or Female Over Male: A Critique of Idolatry," *Soundings* 69, (1986), pp. 464-477; Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Remembering Her: Feminist Readings of the Christian Tradition," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 2, 1 (1986), pp. 118-126; John Shotter and Josephine Logan, "The Pervasiveness of Patriarchy: On Finding a Different Voice," in *Feminist Thought and the Structure of Knowledge*, ed. Mary McConnery Gergen (New York: New York University Press, 1988), pp. 69-86; Vickers, pp. 37-56; Ann Loades, "Practical Consequences," in *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, ed. Ann Loades (London: SPCK, 1990), pp. 194-213; Ann Loades, "The Virgin Mary and the Feminist Quest," in *After Eve*, ed. Janet Martin Soskice, pp. 156-178; Daphne Hampson, *Theology and Feminism*, p. 108ff.; Mary McClintock Fulkerson, "Contesting Feminist Canons: Discourse and the Problem of Sexist Texts," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 7, 2 (1991), pp. 53-73.

⁶³ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 2.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

refuses to examine itself in terms of the victimization of women that it promotes.⁶⁷ Women as objectified by the male symbolic and linguistic systems becomes the prototype for all others who are objectified and seen as different.⁶⁸ The psychology of vested interests works in patriarchy to maintain the status quo.⁶⁹ The real, but disguised values of patriarchy, are greed, ambition, deceit, and the absolute obedience and objectification of women, who though idealized as more moral than men, are excluded from power and described as incapable of moral thinking.⁷⁰ Patriarchy uses economic resources to control women's issues;⁷¹ it constructs labels like homosexuality and heterosexuality to keep sexuality under patriarchal control,⁷² and to keep sexuality as a source of intimidation.⁷³ Patriarchy constructs the private-public mirage, denying that " 'the personal is political,' that the power structures get into the fabric of one's psyche and personal relationships: [that] this is 'sexual politics.' " ⁷⁴ Patriarchy divides and conquers through paternalistic behaviour and manipulation of the women's movement, pretending support so long as no change is required.⁷⁵ Philosophy is also a political construct serving the vested interests of its originators. Being, reified in the sexual caste system, is then an object for control of the male elites. This reification is propagandized in fairy tales, popular songs, films, advertisements, and political speeches.⁷⁶ When women expose the patriarchal political plot they are met with a backlash of ridicule, insults, and instant psychoanalysis.⁷⁷

These themes are picked up and expanded in *Gyn/Ecology* and *Pure Lust*. *Gyn/Ecology* reiterates Daly's belief that women in patriarchy are seen merely as an aspect of the culture,⁷⁸ and

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 45.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 46.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 51.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 113.

⁷² Ibid., p. 125.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 126.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 127.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 136.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 183.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 51.

⁷⁸ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 129.

that their work is trivialized and hidden.⁷⁹ The sexual stereotypical woman is pacified, recycled, eliminated, assimilated alive: in short, vampirized.⁸⁰ The symbolic and linguistic control exercised by patriarchy is geared to the destruction of women in order to meet male needs,⁸¹ and with male complicity.⁸² Patriarchal scholars are apologists for this project.⁸³ The psychology of vested interests precludes justice for women,⁸⁴ and it erases and reverses women's past which is then appropriated by patriarchal males.⁸⁵ These interests impose poverty on women,⁸⁶ who become token torturers of each other,⁸⁷ and these interests lead to a war on life itself.⁸⁸ Stories like *Charlotte's Web*, and *The Giving Tree* promote male sadism and female masochism. They promote gynocide.⁸⁹ The media portrayal of women is a betrayal that grinds women down.⁹⁰ The psychoanalytic backlash is found in the analysis of witches whose death is seen as therapeutic for society,⁹¹ or as a result of their being failures as women⁹² or because they were insane.⁹³

In *Pure Lust* Daly describes the sexual caste of untouchables in Hinduism.⁹⁴ This sexual caste system is a global conspiracy⁹⁵ to maintain male control⁹⁶ and to restore women to "femininity and desirability"- for men.⁹⁷ Symbolic and linguistic control is maintained by experience mediated by males⁹⁸ and the patriarchal environment of confessionality that claims

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 127 ff.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 192.

⁸² Ibid., p. 109.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 112.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 202.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 349.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 352.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 140.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 355.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 395.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 348.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 184.

⁹² Ibid., p. 209.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 212.

⁹⁴ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 238 ff.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 45.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 410.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 136.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 50.

total ownership of each person's being.⁹⁹ At the universities women are brainwashed subliminally with and by the patriarchal version of reality and they become its walking talking ambassadors.¹⁰⁰ A Sado-Symbol Syndrome of static, changeless, necrophilic fraudulent male symbols chokes the cosmos.¹⁰¹

A continual state of emergency is part of the psychological vested interest of patriarchy, making male concerns always prior to women's concerns.¹⁰² The object of sadosexual politics is the effacement of women,¹⁰³ of having women become their own worst enemies,¹⁰⁴ of having women fear their own potential for self-destruction and the destruction of others.¹⁰⁵ Daly deals extensively in this text with the patriarchal use of women as token torturers of each other.¹⁰⁶ The vested patriarchal political philosophy complements the vested patriarchal political psychology. The plastic passions and virtues of patriarchy permeate its institutions and work to destroy its women.¹⁰⁷ Women who rage against patriarchy are labelled hostile and bitter,¹⁰⁸ and labels like lesbian, man-hater, and separatist are used to stop thought and intimidate would be-radical feminists.¹⁰⁹

Finally, the patriarchal war against women is waged through continual injections of sado-masochistic "fairy tales, fashions, theology, psychology, romance, literature..."¹¹⁰ that cause sensory overload and mental paralysis.¹¹¹ In an interesting analysis of the film "Tootsie", Daly points out how patriarchy portrays men as being better women than women at being women, and as being a better friend to women than women are to each other.¹¹²

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 145.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 165.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 406 ff.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 372.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 64.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 192.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 249.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pages 61, 68, 108 ff., 144, 165, 189 ff., 212, 249, 378.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 122.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., pages 206, 251, 363,

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 60.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 63.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 208 ff.

ii) Patriarchal Religion as the Embodiment and Perpetrator of the Sexual Caste System

A major theme in *Beyond God the Father* is the effect of a male god who generates god-males, and the consequent Divine Plan that generates sex role stereotyping and the derivative status of women.¹¹³ God's role as judge of sin becomes a political tool for maintaining the patriarchal status quo, for perpetrating a false consciousness and destructive guilt feelings.¹¹⁴ Daly believes that the Judeo-Christian tradition aids and abets our sick society.¹¹⁵

Male theologians' defensive response to the confrontation from feminist theologians is disguised in universalization (women are not the only outsiders), particularization (women victimized only in certain times and places), spiritualization (things will be equalized at the eschaton), and trivialisation (women need to look at more serious issues).¹¹⁶

Daly sees the Virgin Mary as a male construction to punish real women who can not be both virgins and mothers,¹¹⁷ and to ensure women's subordination.¹¹⁸ Mary's virginity is under male control;¹¹⁹ the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception reifies the sexual caste system.¹²⁰ The Roman Catholic Church tries to harness women's power and energy through the mesmerizing symbol of Mary,¹²¹ and claims through the use of Mary to raise the status of women, while the reverse is the real intention.¹²² The Protestant Reformers removed Mary, gave up a few externals, included a few token women, and went on as before.¹²³

In addition, the Church fears allowing women to make decisions for themselves, and thus uses inflammatory language, calling abortion murder, and the fetus a child.¹²⁴ This obsessive and

¹¹³ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 13.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

exclusive identification of life with the life of the fetus becomes blurry when it comes to the failure of the Church to fight for the lives of those endangered by war.¹²⁵

When it comes to healing, the Church supports the male elitism of the few who feed off women's illness. The Church grants "delayed and partial healing that keeps control in the hands of a few, perpetuating the dichotomy between 'agent' and 'patient' and reflecting a condition in society in which power is divorced from real love."¹²⁶ In this way, also, religion justifies the psychosomatic illness that is inflicted on women by patriarchal society.¹²⁷

Finally, the clergy arrogate women's functions in a kind of spiritual transexualism, converting their washing, feeding, giving birth, consoling, clothing, and strengthening into sacraments that the clergy not only control but present as more essential than anything a woman could ever do.¹²⁸

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly enlarges on her 'if god is male, the male is god' observation.¹²⁹ She describes the Christian trinity as the paradigm of all male processions, "representing the closed system of eyeball-to-eyeball self-congratulatory communion among the fathers and sons. It is the model merger, the central committee, the consummate conglomerate."¹³⁰ She sees the Christian god as a "transsexed caricature of the great Hag herself."¹³¹ Jesus' rebirth in baptism and in the resurrection without Mary completely erases women from the male god scene. Jesus becomes the feminine male god who is self-mothered.¹³² The basic intention of Christological doctrines is the patriarchal final solution: the elimination of women.¹³³

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 119.

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 161.

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 161.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 195.

¹²⁹ See *Beyond God the Father*, p. 181 for Daly's tentative exploration of the masculinity of God and the possibility that this unofficial consensus was really more a reflection of what males thought of themselves than of what they believed about God. cf., p. 66.

¹³⁰ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 75.

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 86.

¹³² Ibid., p. 87.

¹³³ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

God as judge of sin becomes the god of the Torture Cross Mythology, which allowed Witchburning to be a *crimen exceptum* allowing the torture of women without limit, and without accountability.¹³⁴ “Under the Sign of the Cross good and wise women were tortured and burned to death.”¹³⁵ The sick society that Christianity aids and abets is a sado-spiritual society,¹³⁶ a perpetual witchcraze¹³⁷ continued in the contemporary secular society that has assumed the murderous and misogynist Christian symbolism¹³⁸ as expressed in the refined Christian rapism that permeates the planet as a subculture of sadism in medicine, pharmaceuticals, death camps, hospitals and political prisons.¹³⁹

Daly describes the Annunciation as the mind and body rape of Mary.¹⁴⁰ She sees Mary as the Crushed Crone “flaunted before us as the symbol of our tamed Fury.”¹⁴¹ The Protestants who eliminated Mary replaced her with an androgynous Jesus who became male feminism incarnate, and who accepts the sadism that aims at eliminating women.¹⁴²

The Church’s fear of women is further expressed in its tendency to blame the victim when women are raped.¹⁴³ Certainly since religion teaches that women are worthless, holding them responsible for their victimization seems reasonable and virtuous.¹⁴⁴ The Church expressed its fear of women healers by murdering them during the Witchcraze, and attributing women’s power to heal to the devil: Daly sees this as the Church’s desire to control knowledge so that it could control mankind.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 95.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 195.

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 89.

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 96.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 85.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 122.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 218.

A new theme in *Gyn/Ecology* is Daly's belief that Christianity prepares people to accept the bizarre, and therefore to be vulnerable to all sorts of mind rape.¹⁴⁶ Women are to believe in the irrevocable death of the goddess, and thus the irrevocable death of their autonomous selves.¹⁴⁷ The Christian myth of the end of the world is moving toward its patriarchal self-fulfillment.¹⁴⁸

The overall theme in *Pure Lust* is patriarchal deception. Two major manifestations of that are presented through the Biggest Lies of false consciousness in general, and through Mariology in particular. Daly elaborates on the false consciousness created by the mystification of roles: D.H. Lawrence's fate is tragic, whereas women's fate is never tragic because it is divinely ordained;¹⁴⁹ the narcissistic self-reflections of a Dag Hammarskjöld are worthy of high esteem while such a luxury is afforded few women in patriarchy.¹⁵⁰ Daly talks about this and all the kinds of false consciousness in patriarchy under the rubric of Biggest Lies,¹⁵¹ a condition of mind rape for which patriarchal religious doctrines like the Real Presence¹⁵² paves the way. Both theology and pornography are one "in the promulgation of deception."¹⁵³ For Daly, John Stoltenberg "accurately names the game."¹⁵⁴

In order to believe that relationships between sadists and masochists are 'liberated,' one would have to believe that contempt is caring, that humiliation is respect, that brutality is affection, and that bondage is freedom. The fact that many women do so believe is a measure of the extent to which men have destroyed women's consciousness.¹⁵⁵

Horizontal violence, displaced guilt feelings, and traditional virtues are other tools of 'the game,'¹⁵⁶ along with the seductive devices of depreciation (formerly trivialization¹⁵⁷),

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 110.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 102.

¹⁴⁹ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 44.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 44.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 53.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁵⁵ John Stoltenberg, "Sadomasochism: Eroticized Violence, Eroticized Powerlessness." in *Against Sadomasochism: A Radical Feminist Analysis*, ed. Robin Ruth Linden, Darlene R. Pagano, Diana E.H. Russell, Susan Leigh Star (East Palo Alto: Frog in the Well, 1982), p. 129, quoted in Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 66.

universalization, particularization, and spiritualization.¹⁵⁸ Daly concludes that “in the equation of all women with evil is the moral correctness of gynocide.”¹⁵⁹

Mary who retains vestiges of the Goddess, becomes the patriarchal archetype for the Great pro-life Papal Mother who champions “imprisonment in the family, fetal rights, and discreet Christian gynocide.”¹⁶⁰ Daly ties the proclamation of the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption to the political efforts to kill the women’s movement and to compensate women who were being sent back to the kitchen after World War II.

iii) Misogyny as the Root Paradigm of Patriarchy

Daly states in *Beyond God the Father* that misogyny is the root paradigm of all other violence, be it racism, nuclearism, man-made poverty, or chemical contamination.¹⁶¹ (This belief, translated into the root of patriarchal male pathology in Daly’s psychological paradigm, along with her translation of her ontology into her psychological paradigm, are the focal points of this thesis.) Daly cites the mythology of Eve of the Jewish and Christian tradition, as the prime culprit whose effects are still being felt in secular society’s view of women and her bodily functions.¹⁶² Women, constructed in this myth as ontologically evil, are the male-created foils of their own failures.¹⁶³ The scapegoating of women as good and evil is entirely constructed around the needs of men for property and lineage and an outlet for their lust.¹⁶⁴ Destroying the victims of misogyny, especially the poor and the socially deviant, takes many forms: witchburning, lobotomy, unsafe abortion, and surgical experimentation.¹⁶⁵ All patriarchal laws are stacked

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., pages 69-70, 261 ff..

¹⁵⁷ See *Beyond God the Father*, pp. 80-81.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 320ff.

¹⁵⁹ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 271.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 82.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., p. xiv.

¹⁶² Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 45.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 62 ff.

against women in favour of men.¹⁶⁶ Because men are revived by women's deaths, Daly believes that there is no turning back from misogyny.¹⁶⁷

Gyn/Ecology reiterates many of the themes presented in *Beyond God the Father*, as Daly focuses on five particular global historical expressions of patriarchal misogyny. These historical expressions are Indian *suttee*,¹⁶⁸ Chinese Footbinding,¹⁶⁹ African genital mutilation,¹⁷⁰ European witchburning,¹⁷¹ and western gynecology.¹⁷²

The Preface of *Pure Lust* begins:

This book is being published in the 1980s - a period of extreme danger for women and for our sister the earth and her other creatures, all of whom are targeted by the maniacal fathers, sons, and holy ghosts for extinction by nuclear holocaust, or, failing that, by chemical contamination, by escalated ordinary violence, by man-made hunger and disease that proliferate in a climate of deception and mind-rot. Within the general context of this decade's horrors, women face in our daily lives forces whose intent is to mangle, strangle, tame, and turn us against our own purposes.¹⁷³

Daly believes that women are the real target of attack in all wars,¹⁷⁴ that in the Sado-Society of patriarchy, sadomasochism is 'The Rule,'¹⁷⁵ that "So terrible is the lust, the intent to destroy female nature, that women commonly attempt to erase their Selves in order to be spared."¹⁷⁶ In patriarchy, a feminist woman's suicide is a tidy solution. In patriarchy's everyday climate of tidy torture of women¹⁷⁷ women's illnesses are used to neutralize their anger against men. Instead of expressing their anger with men, women turn their anger on themselves in acts of self-destruction.¹⁷⁸

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 62, 110.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 160.

¹⁶⁸ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 113 ff.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 134ff.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 153ff.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 178ff.

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 223ff.

¹⁷³ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. ix.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 127.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 139.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 298 ff.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 358.

b) Philosophical Themes

Ontology, Memory, the Journey, Naming, and Transvaluation of Values are the five philosophical themes in Daly's work that will be briefly reviewed here. Each of these themes find their way into Daly's psychological paradigm.

i) Ontology

Daly lays out much of the philosophical landscape of her work on ontology in *Beyond God the Father*. She writes about various aspects of Women's being, patriarchal male being, and ultimate being.¹⁷⁹

Women will become who they are when they face nothingness, transcend patriarchy, and participate in Being.¹⁸⁰ In the Power of Presence, women-identified-women attract others into the Biophilic bonding and radical aloneness of Sisterhood.¹⁸¹ Sisterhood is a communal, creative,

¹⁷⁹ For comments on Daly's treatment of these ontological themes see: Fiorenza, "Why Not a Category of Friend/Friendship?" pp. 117-118; Burkhart, pp. 119-120; Bryan, pp. 40-49; Christ, "The New Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature," pp. 203-206; Paul K.K. Tong, "The Sex of God: A Critique of Mary Daly's Transcendental Theology for Women's Liberation," in *God, Sex and the Social Project*, ed. J.H. Grace (Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1978), pp. 39-50; Heyward, pp. 66-72; Kraemer, pp. 354-356; Marjorie Suchocki, "The Challenge of Mary Daly," pp. 307-317 and "The Idea of God in Feminist Philosophy," *Hypatia* 9, 4 (1994), pp. 57-68; Barbara Hilkert Andolsen, "Racism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Women's Movements: An Ethical Appraisal" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt College, 1981); Stenger, "A Critical Analysis of the Influence of Paul Tillich on Mary Daly's Feminist Theology," pp. 219-238; Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, and *Disputed Questions: On Being a Christian* (New York: Orbis, 1989), p. 127 ff; Everson, "Bodyself: Women's Bodily Experience in Recent Feminist Theology and Women's Literature,"; Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*; Midge Quant, "Mary Daly's Latest Philosophical Quest," *New Directions For Women* (September/October 1984), p. 14; Martindale, pp. 54-55; Harrower, "Feminist Critiques of a Male Savior: Christology in the Writings of Mary Daly and Rosemary Ruether," Sheila Davaney, "The Limits of the Appeal to Women's Experience," in *Shaping New Vision: Gender and Values in American Culture*, ed. Clarissa W. Atkinson, Constance H. Buchanan, Margaret Miles (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. 1987), 31-49; Andrea Nye, *Feminist Theories and the Philosophies of Man* (New York: Routledge, 1988), pp. 82-102; Berry, "Feminist Theology: The 'Verbing' of Ultimate/Intimate Reality in Mary Daly,"; Linda Alcoff, "Cultural Feminism Versus Post Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory," *Signs* 13, 3 (1988), pp. 405-436; Debra Shultz, "An Antidote for Academedia," *Belles Lettres* (March /April 1988), pp. 4, 15; Olds, "Metaphors of Hierarchy and Interrelatedness in Hildegard of Bingen and Mary Daly,"; Harrison, "The Power of Anger in the Work of Love: Christian Ethics for Women and Other Strangers,"; Jane Flax, "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory," in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. Linda J. Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 39-62; Judith Halberstam, "Automating Gender: Postmodern Feminism in the Age of the Intelligent Machine."

¹⁸⁰ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, pages 27-28, 32-33, 37, 51.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pages 3 ff., 75, 96, for example.

political ontophany, that is nonhierarchial and multidimensional; a leap in human evolution.¹⁸² It refuses co-optation,¹⁸³ and it refuses to be 'other.'¹⁸⁴ The Presence of Presence in women is ontological self-affirmation,¹⁸⁵ and the affirmation of the becoming of women is a theophany.¹⁸⁶ In the New Space of women's Biophilic be-ing, there is a new, invisible and inviolable centre encompassing the Presence of Presence of women and the Absence of Presence of men.¹⁸⁷ This New Space is a Sacred Space, a province of the mind, constantly moving, whose life source is the Journey, and whose struggle is self-affirmation.¹⁸⁸ The New Time of Biophilic women is the present and the future.¹⁸⁹ Rage is the positive and creative force needed to break through to Be-ing from nothingness.¹⁹⁰ The religious struggle is an ontological struggle of be-ing versus non-being;¹⁹¹ the "New Be-ing of Antichurch is a rising up of Mother and Daughter together..."¹⁹² the dynamic spiritualization of consciousness and the communal incarnation of that consciousness.¹⁹³ For Biophilic be-ing to survive there must be "continual communal striving in be-ing. This means forging the great chain of be-ing in Sisterhood that can surround nonbeing, forcing it to shrink back into itself."¹⁹⁴ As well metapatriarchal metamorphosis and existential courage to be, to see, and to sin are required.¹⁹⁵ Revelatory power resides in the women's revolution;¹⁹⁶ women's experiential knowledge will cause a Fall into the Sacred.¹⁹⁷ The Second Coming of Women is the key to salvation from patriarchy;¹⁹⁸ the Anti-Church of Sisterhood will bring forth New Be-ing.¹⁹⁹

¹⁸² Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 104.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 155.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 133.

¹⁹² Ibid., p. 150.

¹⁹³ Ibid., p. 154.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 198.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., pages 24, 34.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 96.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 139.

The patriarchal male cannot be reformed or improved.²⁰⁰ He embodies the Presence of Absence.²⁰¹ Male liberation is only possible through women's liberation.²⁰² Patriarchal time is time past where the best has already been.²⁰³ The male myth of Eve is the Primordial Lie that misnames evil and therefore misnames all else.²⁰⁴ The male mentality is rapist,²⁰⁵ intent on rape, genocide, and war.²⁰⁶ Because the patriarchal male is governed by technical reason he is cut off from ontological reason.²⁰⁷ If men are willing to give up their privileges and listen to women "they might succeed in becoming human."²⁰⁸ Male clergy are spiritually trans-sexualized Male Mothers, called Fathers who "perceive the world backwards, clearly."²⁰⁹ Patriarchal men are on their own to face themselves and their projections;²¹⁰ when they discover that they are the Enemy, all wars will end.²¹¹

Ultimate Reality is Be-ing, the Good, the Verb "from whom, in whom, and with whom all movements move."²¹² Biophilic women must recognize that there can be no power over Ultimate Reality, only power with and through participation in Ultimate Reality. This awareness frees women from idolatry, even in their own cause, because all that is valued may be transitory.²¹³ Biophilic women participate in the unfolding of God,²¹⁴ in an I-Thou, I-Ens or I-Being²¹⁵

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. xx.

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 36.

²⁰² Ibid., p. 42.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 45. See John Ralston Saul, *Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West* (Toronto: Penguin, 1992), pp. 581-582, for a very interesting, almost parallel but admittedly humanistic critique of the structures in the West that acknowledges that we have eliminated all memories of what came before reason and are thus going round in circles. "There are no solid references to give us direction, no active contradictions. In effect we are now in our own past." p. 582.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 47.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 109.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 114 ff.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 120.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 172.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 195.

²¹⁰ Ibid., p. 197.

²¹¹ Ibid., p. 198.

²¹² Ibid., pages xxix, 34.

²¹³ Ibid., p. 29.

²¹⁴ Ibid., p. 43.

²¹⁵ "The I-Ens... is intimate, fluid and present. The Ens is characterized by givenness. It is not perceived as an object to be used, but is beheld in its own splendor, which gives rise to wonder." Ibid., p. 178.

relationship which is possible only with women's becoming.²¹⁶ Ultimate Reality has not been revealed as a once for all time revelation. Wherever true be-ing is found, new and genuine hierophanies are found "because of Participation in Be-ing which is Be-ing."²¹⁷

Most of what Daly has to say about women's ontology in *Gyn/Ecology* can be classified under the rubric of Sisterhood. It is spoken of as depending on the recognition of the "divine Spark in the Self and other Selves and accepting this Spark."²¹⁸ A woman's sister Self is non necrophilic,²¹⁹ a Dreadless Self that is a result of the Self's confrontation with its Self.²²⁰ The similarity among sisters allows for differences; there can be no equality among unique Selves, there can only be being equal to the task at hand.²²¹ A sister's integrity of be-ing reconnects all that is disconnected in the cosmos.²²² The sister Self is a Sacred Space, a holy environment.²²³ "As she creates her Self she creates New Space: semantic, cognitive, symbolic, psychic, physical spaces. She moves into these spaces and finds room to breathe, to breathe for the further space."²²⁴ Daly states again that the best tactic for sisters is to keep moving beyond patriarchy to a space of one's own.²²⁵ When the inherent friendship dynamic in the mother-daughter relationship is released through the recognition of their shared status as daughters, their original divinity is recovered, and their call to struggle as sisters is revealed.²²⁶ "From this perspective of Daughter-Right women can ask the radical ontological questions, not only about the evil and pain inflicted upon our lives under the reign of fathers, sons, and holy ghosts, but also about our be-ing, our Journey into the Otherworld."²²⁷ The Self of sisters is Wild,²²⁸ asking the deepest

²¹⁶ Ibid., p. 178.

²¹⁷ Ibid., p. 183.

²¹⁸ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 382.

²¹⁹ Ibid., p. 373.

²²⁰ Ibid., p. 383.

²²¹ Ibid., pp. 383-384.

²²² Ibid., p. 389 ff.

²²³ Ibid., p. 338.

²²⁴ Ibid., p. 340.

²²⁵ Ibid., pages 342, 358, 380.

²²⁶ Ibid., pages 41, 346ff.

²²⁷ Ibid., p. 347.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 343.

whys²²⁹ “seeking a permanently altering state of consciousness... Sister Selves are the only Selves who can bond together and con-quest beyond, before, beneath, and around the seductive pseudowords.”²³⁰ Sisterhood’s intuition of integrity is the measure of patriarchal consciousness.²³¹

Daly continues to refer to the patriarchal male as the Enemy and agent of women’s misery,²³² and she describes the Presence of Absence of the patriarchal state as a holographic illusion of substance and wholeness.²³³ Patriarchy is a State of Robotitude in which living is just not dying,²³⁴ and whose goal is the elimination of Self-Centering Sisterhood.²³⁵ Daly continues to see the nature of the patriarchal male and his patriarchal state as life - and women-hating:

*Patriarchy is itself the prevailing religion of the entire planet, and its essential message is necrophilia. All of the so-called religions legitimating patriarchy are mere sects subsumed under its vast umbrella/canopy: And the symbolic message of all the sects of the religion which is patriarchy is this: Women are the dreaded anomie. Consequently, women are the objects of male terror, the projected personifications of ‘The Enemy,’ the real objects under attack in all the wars of patriarchy.*²³⁶

Men desire to control women’s bodies;²³⁷ they envy women’s creativity.²³⁸ The normal mode of the male is sadomasochistic.²³⁹ Using Valerie Solanas’ analysis, Daly posits that the male projects his innate passivity onto women, and thus must constantly prove that he is active, which he does through necrophilic acts.²⁴⁰ The Fire of women’s becoming will force men to face their history of

²²⁹ Ibid., p. 343.

²³⁰ Ibid., p. 345.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 386.

²³² Ibid., p. 29.

²³³ Ibid., p. 50.

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 55.

²³⁵ Ibid., p. 53.

²³⁶ Ibid., p. 39.

²³⁷ Ibid., p. 59.

²³⁸ Ibid., p. 60.

²³⁹ Ibid., p. 387 ff.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 360 ff.

atrocities. This, says Daly, “is his unbearable ‘beatific vision,’ his last end.”²⁴¹ Patriarchal Male Mothers give “birth only to putrefaction and deception.”²⁴² in himself, he is a fetal parasite.²⁴³

Pure Lust picks up and expands the ontological themes introduced in *Beyond God the Father*. Women must struggle for Elemental participation in Be-ing. “Our passion is for that which is most intimate and most ultimate, for depth and transcendence, for recalling original wholeness.”²⁴⁴ Daly picks up the theme of the Power of Presence, and the Presence of Presence, calling it also Real and Realizing Presence, all a result of Participation in the Powers of Be-ing.²⁴⁵ Real Presence is presentient,²⁴⁶ contagious,²⁴⁷ healing²⁴⁸ and animated with hope.²⁴⁹ Realizing Presence “is active potency/power to create and to transform, to render present in place and time.”²⁵⁰ A woman’s soul is her purposive centre and source; it is not her Self. Rather the soul is in every part of a woman’s be-ing giving her “an essential integrity at the very core of her Self.”²⁵¹ Each woman has only one Self: There are not many Selves in one woman, but rather one Self, wholly present in that woman.²⁵² The difference between Biophilic and patriarchal women is “not merely accidental, but rather *essential*.”²⁵³ To Marcuse’s disbelief in the possible realization of the revisionist Freudian view, that one’s goal ought to be the “‘optimal development of a person’s potential and the realization of his individuality[,]’”²⁵⁴ Daly responds: “Radical Feminism, in so far as it is true to itself, is the Denial of this denial.”²⁵⁵ As for Thomas Aquinas, Daly declares that within patriarchy, women are misbegotten males.²⁵⁶

²⁴¹ Ibid., p. 384.

²⁴² Ibid., p. 195.

²⁴³ Ibid., p. 60.

²⁴⁴ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. ix. See also pages 4, 20, 81, 138, 175, 389 for additional aspects of this state of becoming.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 146.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 147.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 150.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 371.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 148.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 149.

²⁵¹ Ibid., p. 345.

²⁵² Ibid., p. 145.

²⁵³ Ibid., p. 351.

²⁵⁴ Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization* (New York: Vintage, 1955), p. 235, as quoted by Daly in *Pure Lust*, p. 359.

Daly reminds that an aspect of Sisterhood is radical Aloneness,²⁵⁷ that beneath the great diversity among women is a radical connectedness,²⁵⁸ a weaving together of the Dream of a Common Language, a Metabeing of the “common bonding of Lusty women.”²⁵⁹ A woman who belongs to the Sisterhood has “made a choice to be *for women*, to be loyal to women, and therefore she has become a member of a cognitive and affective minority.”²⁶⁰

The political ontophany Daly addresses in *Beyond God the Father* is described as ‘Realizing’ in *Pure Lust*. “Realizing is a ‘creative political ontophany.’ It is continuing manifestation of be-ing; it is participation in creation, overcoming the reason-blocking elementary constructs, unfolding the potentialities of be-ing.”²⁶¹ Women’s New Time and New Space is in the Background, a homeland for woman that does not preclude political struggle on the borders of patriarchy. “But that struggle is inadequate without Pure Lust, the active longing that propels a woman into her own ‘country,’ that is, into the Realms of Elemental Reality, of ontological depth.”²⁶² The Background is a time/space of continual transformation²⁶³ where women “encounter/uncover our own First Questions and hence find our First Philosophy.”²⁶⁴ Political harmony in the Background depends on recognition of diversity.²⁶⁵

The creative Rage of *Beyond God the Father* rages on as a deep ontological Fury in the “dis-discovery” of women’s original be-ing, in anger at women’s erasure.²⁶⁶ Daly believes that “Righteous Rage makes love, desire, and joy realistic, unsentimental... Freed Fury makes hate,

²⁵⁵ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 359.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 321.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

aversion, and sorrow biophilic.”²⁶⁷ Daly responds to her critics that “Rage is not a stage. It is not something to be gotten over.”²⁶⁸

The courage to be, see and to sin is the ontological courage to refuse to be patriarchal women;²⁶⁹ to be daringly and defiantly one’s original, unappeasable Self.²⁷⁰ Ontological courage is a taking heart that unites reason and passion that “transforms, transvalues, virtues, desiring, acquiring Volcanic Virtue.”²⁷¹ A woman’s “Taking Heart is the magic Self-woman carpet that carries her to Metabeing...”²⁷²

Daly has a great deal to say about the theme of metapatriarchal metamorphosis.²⁷³ The Biophilic woman is clairvoyant and creative,²⁷⁴ moving in myth-breaking movements,²⁷⁵ actively becoming her Fate.²⁷⁶ She bonds with other Biophilic women and “with the sun and moon, the tides, and all of the elements... [and] has unbounded Powers of Self-transformation.”²⁷⁷ Her Stamina creates harmony within and among Biophilic women.²⁷⁸ The ontological metamorphosis of Biophilic women is expressed in Be-Friending, Be-Longing, and Be-Witching.²⁷⁹ She enters the “Metamorphospheres” by exorcising the patriarchal demons, “Continuing on the Journey, refusing to be distracted...”²⁸⁰ Further, “Metamorphosing women are Unfolding as *whole* intellectual/sentient/passionate Selves...”²⁸¹ Metamorphosis implies macroevolution that eschews dualism as inadequate;²⁸² macroevolution itself is the transformation from one species to

²⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 257.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 375. See Ruether, *Sexism and God Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, p. 187: “The journey into that deeper anger does not mean that one has to remain there permanently.”

²⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 151 ff.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 176.

²⁷¹ Ibid., p. 281.

²⁷² Ibid., p. 281.

²⁷³ Ibid., p. 307 ff.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 308.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 310.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 311.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 311.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 312.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 317.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 333.

²⁸¹ Ibid., p. 347.

²⁸² Ibid., p. 349.

another.²⁸³ Biophilic women “experience as ineffably accidental our connection with the species that has planned and executed witchcrazes, death camps, slavery, torture, racism in all its manifestations, world famine, chemical contamination, animal experimentation, the nuclear arms race.”²⁸⁴ Daly believes that the difference between Biophilic women and patriarchal men is “not merely accidental, but rather essential.”²⁸⁵ Daly believes that friendships among women that are not metamorphic “almost always [have] an atmosphere of tragedy... a vague sense of something missing...”²⁸⁶ For Daly, “The Starting point of a woman’s metapatriarchal Metamorphosis is an ontological intuition of her Otherness...”²⁸⁷ regarding all that is patriarchal.

Daly speaks briefly of the feminist epiphany being the moment a woman realizes that she is a radical feminist.²⁸⁸ As well, she develops the theme of Elemental knowing. It is “intuitive/immediate, not mediated by the omnipresent myths of phallicism...”²⁸⁹ It “is the force of reason rooted in instinct, intuition, passion.”²⁹⁰ It seeks to understand first principles.²⁹¹ Biophilic women believe in this transcendental knowledge and yet continue to be open to uncertainty.²⁹² Elemental knowing leads to the first philosophy of the first sex which is an ontology that is “radically metaphysical and concerned with ontological potency, knowledge, passion, virtue, creation, transformation.”²⁹³ Daly believes that “The radiant gynergy that women experience when deeply focused pulses in harmony with the rhythms of the cosmos...”²⁹⁴ She adds, “To sin against the society of sado-sublimation is to be intellectual in the most direct and daring way,

²⁸³ Ibid., p. 350.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 350-351.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 351.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 379.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 395.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 237.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., p. ix.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁹¹ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁹² Ibid., p. 12.

²⁹³ Ibid., p. 26.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 115.

claiming and trusting the deep correspondence between the structures/processes of one's own mind and the structures/processes of reality."²⁹⁵

For patriarchal male ontology, Daly devises a long list of labels with fixers, tricksters, snools among them.²⁹⁶ These are all labels used to depict various aspects of the patriarchal male's sadistic self. These sadistic males create a sado-society and a sado-spirituality that block ontological self-realization in themselves and everyone else.²⁹⁷ For Daly the problem of describing the refined lechery of the Sado-Spiritual Syndrome is "the problem of naming the deep mystery of evil."²⁹⁸ Daly believes the false dichotomy between homo- and hetero- sexuality is tied up with the lecherous attempt to disguise the homoerotic, male-mating that is at the heart of patriarchy.²⁹⁹ Daly believes that patriarchal men fear Biophilic women who are capable of ontological communication because men are not capable of it.³⁰⁰ She sees a disorder at the core of patriarchy that leaves men irretrievably disconnected "from biophilic purpose."³⁰¹

With respect to the ontology of Ultimate Being Daly writes of the Archimage as verb and verbal, as Namer and Speaker, "the Power within who can Name away the archetypes that block the way/words of Metabeing."³⁰² The Archimage as healer restores integrity;³⁰³ "In her essence/quintessence the Archimage is the Muse within us... She who Spirates... She who cannot be defiled or broken down..."³⁰⁴ The Archimage is the underlying unity in all things, the connection of everything that IS "with everything else that IS."³⁰⁵ She also speaks of Ultimate Being as 'It', the all in all³⁰⁶ allowing the "perception of Reality [to be] Allocentric and Metamorphic."³⁰⁷

²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 352.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 20-23.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 35.

²⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 48.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 65.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 363.

³⁰¹ Ibid., p. 364.

³⁰² Ibid., p. 87.

³⁰³ Ibid., p. 89.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., pages 89, 91, 93.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 362.

ii) Memory³⁰⁸

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly states that sexist ritual reinforces the false memories that patriarchy creates to keep women from remembering their real past,³⁰⁹ and that self-actualizing women do not need such rituals.³¹⁰ Daly does not deal with memory in any direct way in *Gyn/Ecology*. In *Pure Lust*, however, she deals with the concept throughout the text. Daly believes that women are struggling to “re-member” their Selves and their history in order to “sustain and intensify biophilic consciousness.”³¹¹ Women need “anamnesia,” “Unforgetting our Elemental connectedness.”³¹² Because women in patriarchy only have a partial memory, they experience it as alienating which limits their ability for a feminist analysis of patriarchy. Everything is seen out of context; the part is taken for the whole; the primary agent is forgotten.³¹³ Elemental Memory, on the other hand, “stirs deep passion . It is E-motional, generating movement out of the Foreground.”³¹⁴ Tidal Memory enables reconnection with the cosmos.³¹⁵ Memory of the future mends the broken connections created by patriarchal amnesia.³¹⁶ Daly believes that “truly focused purposefulness is rooted in deep memory, which we might now call Metamemory.”³¹⁷ Daly writes that women need to remember the “earliest woman-loving experiences with our mothers.”³¹⁸ as a help to accessing Metamemory. Further, she believes that “Feminism essentially means commitment to our past and future memories of Happiness in

³⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 400.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 400.

³⁰⁸ For an interesting view of Daly’s concept of memory see Flora Keshgegian, *To Know By Heart: Toward a Theology of Remembering for Salvation* (Boston College, University Microfilms, 1992).

³⁰⁹ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 142.

³¹⁰ Ibid., p. 146.

³¹¹ Ibid., p. ix.

³¹² Ibid., p. 15.

³¹³ Ibid., p. 170.

³¹⁴ Ibid., p. 171.

³¹⁵ Ibid., p. 173.

³¹⁶ Ibid., p. 303.

³¹⁷ Ibid., p. 355.

³¹⁸ Ibid., p. 357.

defiance of civilization... singing into consciousness awareness of our childhood and ancestral memories... awakening Be-Longing.”³¹⁹

iii) The Journey³²⁰

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly writes of the Journey in terms of Sisterhood and the creative leap into a new women’s world (which in terms of patriarchy, is an anti-world), and renaming this world with women’s names,³²¹ and making it a place for women’s individualization and participation in Be-ing.³²² In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly writes of the Journey to the Background, which is the moving centre of the Self,³²³ a place of radical be-ing, feminist time/space which is “governed by the Witch within...”³²⁴ For the Journey women must risk everything, realizing that there is nothing to lose.³²⁵ In *Pure Lust*, the Journey is an escape from the State of Lechery,³²⁶ a Journey that is “volcanic, epiphanic.”³²⁷ The Vehicles for the Journey are Metaphors, and the destination is the Realms of Metabeing where a woman actively participates in the Powers of Be-ing.³²⁸ The Journey is Weirdward.³²⁹ It involves heightened hope and the temptation to despair.³³⁰

³¹⁹ Ibid., p. 360.

³²⁰ See Everson, pp. 124–126; D’Angelo, “Remembering Her: Feminist Readings of the Christian Tradition,”; Susan B. Thistlethwaite, “God and Her Survival in a Nuclear Age,” *Journal of Feminist Studies* 4 (1988), pp. 73–88; Debra Shultz, “An Antidote for Academedia,”; Olds, p. 65; Harrison, p. 198 ff.; Kathleen Davies, “The Goddess in the Landscape: A Tradition of Twentieth-Century American Women’s Pastoral” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1991), p. 250 ff.

³²¹ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 138.

³²² Ibid., p. 158.

³²³ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 2.

³²⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

³²⁶ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 3.

³²⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 26.

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 221.

³³⁰ Ibid., p. 260.

iv) Naming³³¹

For Daly, Naming is both a philosophical and a political act. In the very beginning of *Beyond God the Father* she writes, "To exist humanly is to name the self, the world, and God."³³² She believes that women are the only ones who can counter the false naming found in patriarchal mythology,³³³ and its understanding of the mystery of evil,³³⁴ and ethics.³³⁵ Mary must be named as the veiled goddess, the negation of female evil, a freeing and healing metaphor.³³⁶ Women must name the patriarchal split between technological and ontological reasoning, with its consequent dichotomizing of everything in patriarchy.³³⁷ Rape must be named as the primordial act of violence creating the basic alienation within the psyche and society.³³⁸ The sexual revolution has to be named as the making of all women more sexually available to all men.³³⁹ Labels must be named as patriarchal intimidators.³⁴⁰ The Christo-centric cosmos must be named as a shelter for patriarchal men from anomie.³⁴¹ The Sisterhood of Women in Cosmic Covenant must rename the cosmos.³⁴² The new naming must be rooted in women's experience.³⁴³

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly touches briefly on some of these aspects of Naming: naming the self,³⁴⁴ naming the misnamed evil,³⁴⁵ the myths and language used for women,³⁴⁶ the disguised male homoerotic mythos of the Christian Trinity, "the perfect all-male marriage, the ideal all-male

³³¹See Berry, "Images of Sin and Salvation in Feminist Theology,"; Julie Gowen, "Ought We To Abandon A Traditional Christian Worldview?" *Studies in Religion* 8, 1 (1979), pp. 83-92; Suchocki, "The Challenge of Mary Daly," pp. 307-317; Nancy J. Peterson, "The Politics of Language: Feminist Theory and the Contemporary Works of Women of Color" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1991), p. 14 ff.; Everson, pp. 124-126.

³³² Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 8.

³³³ Ibid., p. 55.

³³⁴ Ibid., p. 66.

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 102.

³³⁶ Ibid., p. 86ff.

³³⁷ Ibid., p. 103.

³³⁸ Ibid., p. 118.

³³⁹ Ibid., pp. 123-124.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 126.

³⁴¹ Ibid., p. 141.

³⁴² Ibid., p. 159.

³⁴³ Ibid., p. 189.

³⁴⁴ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 29.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 9.

family, the best boys' club..."³⁴⁷ Women must name the Biggest Lies (omniabsent god, Jesus as pseudo mother goddess³⁴⁸) and the Deadly Sins of patriarchy.³⁴⁹ Women must name the patriarchal ethic of good and evil as unapplicable in a world where women honour their Selves and the Selves of other women.³⁵⁰ Women must name femininity as a male construction.³⁵¹ Feminist therapy must be named as an oxymoron which shields "the Self against Self-strengthening Aloneness."³⁵² And women must name the ultimate irony: "the desertion of courageous Searchers/Spinsters/ by threatened pseudo sisters, whose cowardice/absence casts strong women into the role of martyrs/scapegoats for feminism."³⁵³

In *Pure Lust* Daly continues the theme of Naming. A priority for Biophilic women is Naming their Selves and all biophilic life.³⁵⁴ Daly names evil as that which distracts a woman from her true purpose.³⁵⁵ For Daly, the solution to anything patriarchal is to Name it. This Naming involves E-motional analysis and ontological knowing.³⁵⁶ In this spirit, Daly continues her Naming of the Mary myths³⁵⁷ and the Translucent Transcendence that myths like the Assumption veil.³⁵⁸ The Phallic Presence of Absence is dissolved by Naming it in a gynocentric context.³⁵⁹ In regard to knowing, Biophilic women intuitively know "that the passive potency to hear/see/receive knowledge of the Background is interconnected with active potency to Name..."³⁶⁰ As for feminism, Daly posits that there is no 'beyond it', "if we understand feminism to mean the radical, ontological process of Realizing female Elemental potency, one does not

³⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 37.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 79-80.

³⁴⁹ Ibid., pages 19, 30.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

³⁵¹ Ibid., p. 69.

³⁵² Ibid., pp. 282-283.

³⁵³ Ibid., p. 346.

³⁵⁴ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 5.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 115.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 132.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 95 ff.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 129.

³⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 149.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 173.

move 'beyond' it. Feminism is a Name for our moving/movement into Metabeing."³⁶¹ Only Biophilic women can Name, "For Naming is a verb that evokes and that *is* a process of active Realizing."³⁶² Biophilic women must name women's separatism for what it is: separation from the patriarchal State of Separation from one's Self.³⁶³ Finally, Daly Names women authored texts that strive to be humanistic and universal, as a contribution to biophilic life that leaves "something to be Desired."³⁶⁴

v) Transvaluation of Values³⁶⁵

Daly defines the transvaluation of values in *Beyond God the Father*, as the courage to be, see and sin. Women have to reject the equal but different argument,³⁶⁶ and to realize that the patriarchal ethic is a feminine ethic whose central characteristic is the obsession with women's obedience.³⁶⁷ Women need existential courage³⁶⁸ to transcend the sex-role stereotyping of patriarchy.³⁶⁹ Ontological reason's intuitiveness needs to be revived to deal with the ambiguous moral issues of the day, like abortion.³⁷⁰ Women must decide for themselves,³⁷¹ and be their own source of moral authority.³⁷² Power, love, and justice are cut off from each other as a result of sexism, leaving us without love and with dominance and legalism.³⁷³ Only when power, love, and justice are unified, can we overcome rape, genocide and war.³⁷⁴

³⁶¹ Ibid., p. 194.

³⁶² Ibid., p. 194.

³⁶³ Ibid., p. 367 ff.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 383.

³⁶⁵ See Bryan, pp. 40-49; Berry, "Images of Sin and Salvation in Feminist Theology," pp. 25-54; Harrison, pp. 194-213.

³⁶⁶ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 98 ff.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 102.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 104.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 105.

³⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 110.

³⁷¹ Ibid., p. 112.

³⁷² Ibid., p. 165.

³⁷³ Ibid., p. 127.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 131.

Gyn/Ecology does not present a philosophical discussion of the transvaluation of values. However, the middle section of *Pure Lust* is dedicated to Daly's vision of a biophilic transvaluation of values.³⁷⁵ She uses the medieval discussion of passions and virtues as a springboard for her discussion, noting that passions move one to action, whereas patriarchal plastic and potted passions preoccupy their possessor.³⁷⁶ The medieval passions are love, desire, joy, hate, aversion, and sorrow.³⁷⁷ Daly's list of plastic/potted passions is: guilt, anxiety, depression, hostility, bitterness, resentment, boredom, resignation, fulfillment (Daly's spelling).³⁷⁸ The medieval virtues are wisdom, knowledge, understanding, prudence, justice, courage and temperance.³⁷⁹ The biophilic virtues are chiefly Nemesis, Courage, and Distemperance.³⁸⁰

c) Psychological Themes

The psychological concepts used in *Beyond God the Father* form the basis of Daly's psychological understanding of patriarchy. They are discussed in greater detail and with more examples in *Gyn/Ecology* and *Pure Lust*. The next chapter will give a detailed description of Daly's psychological understanding of patriarchy as gleaned from these texts. It will become apparent the extent to which Daly has based her psychological paradigm on both her ontological conclusions about patriarchal male and female, and Biophilic women's being, and her political conclusion that misogyny is the root of patriarchal evil.

³⁷⁵ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 143 ff.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 200 ff.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 198.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 200.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 217.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 274 ff.

CHAPTER TWO: DALY'S PSYCHOLOGICAL PARADIGM

2.1 Theologian, Philosopher, and/or Psychologist?

Daly does not consider herself to be a theologian. In Chapter One, pages 6-7, I noted Daly's observation in *Outercourse* that she had resolved her inner "theology or philosophy" struggle by incorporating her theology into her philosophy in the course of writing *Pure Lust*. Daly deconstructs the male god and proceeds to Name things for herself.

Nonetheless, many still consider Daly a theologian. As late as 1991 Daly continues to turn up in theological journals as a subject of discussion. Perhaps the most direct reflection on whether Daly remains a theologian comes from Rosemary Radford Ruether who writes in 1983 that the "basic categories of Christian theology continue to operate in unconscious ways" in Daly's work.

[The]... basic paradigm of classical theology which connects an original good human nature, united to the cosmos and the divine, contrasted with an alienated, fallen, historical condition of humanity (sin, evil). Revelatory, transformative experiences (conversion) disclose the original humanity and allow one to liberate oneself from the sinful distortion of existence. This new humanity is then related to a redemptive community that gathers together and announces a prophetic, critical, or transformative mission against sinful society.¹

Even though I believe that this reflection has merit, I will accede to Daly's belief, especially in light of her failure to develop her perceptions of Ultimate Reality in recognisably theological language. Daphne Hampson observes in 1990 that while Daly is spiritual in the widest understanding of that term, she "has moved beyond any explicitly religious language."² And Hampson includes Daly in her list of secular theologians who fail to write about prayer as that

¹ Ruether, *Sexism and God Talk*, p. 38.

² Hampson, *Theology and Feminism*, p. 168.

connection with “what is”, noting that Daly’s focus is “the self-realization of women and the overcoming of oppression in the new age.”³

Daly is not generally considered a philosopher. There are no references to her work in the traditional philosophy indexes. Feminist scholars, on the other hand, tend to see Daly as both a theologian and a philosopher. Daly, as noted in Chapter One, tells us that her “deepest choice [is] to *be* a philosopher...”⁴ And as a philosopher, her deepest interest is ontology. In *Outercourse* Daly writes that “the core of the philosophy of *Beyond God the Father* is the unifying theme that the women’s revolution is an ontological movement. Continuity with this theme is evident in *Pure Lust* in its “Fierce Focus” on participation in Be-ing and the necessity to follow the Final Cause.”⁵ Daly sees her achievement in *Pure Lust* as “bringing Elemental Ontology into existence.”⁶ As seen in Chapter One, pages 21-23, Daly’s Elemental Ontology endeavours to incarnate by its very expression the various absolutely positive aspects of an elemental woman’s be-ing, while at the same time describing the absolutely negative being of men and women who are trapped in patriarchy. This is, perhaps, also a good way to understand how Daly has submerged theology into her philosophy: her discussion of Ultimate Be-ing is an ontological discussion.

Is Mary Daly a psychologist? In 1968, in an interview with Edward Marion of *U.S. Catholic*, Daly remarked that psychology is “a realm of specialization and theory which isn’t mine,...” and that she is on “shaky ground.” After this caveat, she nonetheless goes on to make the following psychological analysis of clerical self-hate: “I suspect that very often the celibate

³ Ibid., pp. 169-170.

⁴ Daly, *Outercourse*, p. 324.

⁵ Ibid., p. 275.

⁶ Ibid., p. 275.

male cleric is really enacting a kind of self-hatred in his projections about women and in his writings on the second sex...He hates himself because of his susceptibility to temptation...Perhaps as a result of guilt feelings over this projection of all evil into the woman, you have the glorification of the ideal, Mary -..."⁷ This rather sophisticated psychological analysis is just a taste of what is to follow in her subsequent writings.

But does this make Daly a psychologist? It likely depends upon whom one consults.⁸

Arthur Reber writes that,

Psychology simply cannot be defined; indeed, it cannot even be easily characterized. Even if one were to do so, tomorrow would render the effort inadequate. Psychology is what scientists and philosophers of various persuasions have created to try to fulfil the need to understand the minds and behaviors of various organisms from the most primitive to the most complex... It has few boundaries and aside from the canons of science and the ethical standard of a free society it should not have imposed upon it either by its practitioners or critics. It is an attempt to understand what has so far pretty much escaped understanding....⁹

Reber goes on to explain that determining who can be correctly designated a psychologist is "no simple matter." The standard belief is that the title belongs to those who hold the proper degrees in psychology, preferably doctorates in psychology. Yet, he points out that Eric Ericson had no

⁷ Mary Daly, "Mary Daly and the Second Sex," interview by Edward Marion, *U.S. Catholic* 34 (Spring 1968), p. 24. Daly's work described here is close to Karen Horney's belief that self-hate is at the root of pathology, patriarchal or otherwise.

⁸ The 1934 *Dictionary of Psychology* (Howard C. Warren, ed., *Dictionary of Psychology* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934), acknowledges that the term psychology has many different definitions depending on the area covered and the methodology, and that the word psychologist refers to "one versed in the facts, theories, procedures and practical applications of psychology." (pp. 216-217). The 1958 *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms* (Horace B. English and Ava Champney English, *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms: A Guide to Usage* (New York: David McKay, 1958), acknowledges psychology's inescapable connection to philosophy in the past and the present, but defines psychologist as one formally trained in psychology (pp. 419-420). The 1983 *Dictionnaire Usuel de Psychologie* (Norbert Sillamy, *Dictionnaire Usuel de Psychologie* (Paris: Borda, 1983) also acknowledges psychology's inescapable connection to philosophy, and a psychologue is both a person with "un talent particulier de pénétration des pensées et des sentiments d'autrui..." and one formally trained in psychology, with the emphasis on the latter (pp. 541, 547-549). All of these dictionaries acknowledge that one's psychological theory depends on the increasingly varied school or position to which one belongs.

⁹ Arthur S. Reber, *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* (Markham: Penguin, 1985), p. 533.

university degree, Herbert Simon a leading thinker in cognitive psychology is an economist, Jean Piaget was a biologist, and that William James' first course in psychology "was the one he taught."¹⁰ Reber observes that the usual additional requirement that "a psychologist study psychological processes, is equally futile, for each new development in psychology implicates processes once thought to lie in other domains..."¹¹ As for psychological theory, Reber notes that "the term is 'awarded' to almost any honest attempt to provide an explanation of some body of fact or data."¹²

By this account, then, Daly merits inclusion in all three categories. Though she is not a trained psychologist, neither are many of those whose psychological theory is revered in that discipline. Secondly, she belongs to one of the founding and ongoing sources of psychological theory: philosophy. Finally, she is certainly attempting "to understand the minds and behaviors of various organisms..." and the psychological processes of those organisms, which qualifies as "an honest attempt to provide an explanation" of psychological fact and data. However, to meet the qualms of those who prefer the standard credentials, I believe that it is sufficient to note that Daly's ontology, both Elemental and elemental, biophilic and patriarchal, is a psychological ontology, or a psychologized ontology, as evidenced in the psychological analysis of the celibate male cleric in the Marion interview, which is characteristic of Daly's later work.

2.2 Daly as Psychologist of Religion

Susan Henking's article, "Rejected, Reclaimed, Renamed: Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion," published in 1993¹³ deals directly with Daly as a psychological theorist. Henking claims that "Daly's work sponsors a psychology of religion and a dialogue between psychology and religion that opposes sexism."¹⁴ Henking believes that as a psychologist of religion, Daly uses

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 592-593.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 593.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 769.

¹³ Susan E. Henking, "Rejected, Reclaimed, Renamed: Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), 199-207.

psychological theory and method to understand religion as religion. As a participant in the dialogue between theology and religion, “she emphasizes issues and questions that are common to both enterprises.”¹⁵ Finally, Daly investigates psychology and religion as cultural forms “that interact with history.”¹⁶

Henking reviews Daly’s books, noting that in *The Church and the Second Sex* Daly combats the Roman Catholic Church’s misogyny in “heavily psychological language and a psychologically informed theoretical framework... The use of psychologically informed language characterizes Daly’s description of problem and solution: misogyny and patriarchy are founded upon psychological errors, have psychological consequences, and are to be eliminated through a process of psychological transformation.”¹⁷ This strategy is continued and developed in Daly’s subsequent books. Henking observes that as Daly “moves from reformist to radical feminist, her depictions of religion, psychology, and their relation become more complex.”¹⁸

Running parallel to Daly’s psychological analysis is her increasingly radically feminist critique of all things psychological. The critique is mild in *The Church and the Second Sex* and *Beyond God the Father* where Daly observes that psychology and psychoanalysis have taken over the oppressive, misogynist structure and role of religion. Nonetheless, a psychology like Maslow’s is acceptable if it leads to authentic, self-actualizing personhood. By the time of *GynEcology* and *Pure Lust* the “mind gynecologies” of psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis and psychotherapy are seen to be sado-ideologies, the modern lethal weapons for the psychic murder of women’s “Selves.” The *Wickedary* defines psychology as “a disturbed and disturbing area of academentia: (a) field favored by women haters.”¹⁹ Henking argues that because the oppressed have only the language of their oppressors, Daly, like others who challenge patriarchy,

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁷ Henking, p. 200.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 201.

¹⁹ Daly, *Wickedary*, p. 221 quoted in Henking, p. 204.

is forced to use its language to find what truths may lie behind patriarchal psychology²⁰ while using woman identified experience, intuition and observation as the primary source. In this way Daly simultaneously uses and subverts the patriarchal sources.

In spite of some concern about Henking's position outlined below, I believe that she has set in motion a valid critique of Daly's work in the discipline of psychology and religion. Donna Steichen believes Henking is naive, failing to see that Daly's work is derivative both as psychological critique and as reflection on religion.²¹ Paul and Evelyn Vitz also accuse Daly of being derivative and Henking of being naive. Their greater concern is with Daly's lack of psychological training. They feel this is most evident in her application of terms to external social situations that are meant for the description of the intrapsychic phenomena within the individual patient, and the interpsychic phenomena within the psychotherapeutic situation.²² Virginia Hearn is concerned that Daly uses such highly psychologized language to make her case against patriarchy; she is not sure that a psychological mindset and Daly's radically gynocentric vision have much in common.²³ All this having been said, I believe, with Henking, that Daly makes a significant contribution to psychology and religion, by underscoring patriarchal religion's and patriarchal society's psychological pathology and in attempting to construct a psychology of women, which is at once ontological and spiritual. At the same time, I think that Henking fails to critique the psychological pathology within Daly's own psychological analysis of what she judges to be pathological and biophilic. This is where my work will intersect with and build on Henking's. I concur with Henking that Daly uses a psychological frame to state her case about patriarchy and metapatriarchy. I am going to examine this frame, or paradigm, in more detail. I am going to look at the three players in Daly's paradigm: the patriarchal male, the patriarchal

²⁰ Henking, p. 206.

²¹ Donna Steichen, "Religion, Reason, Reality: Reinterpreted, Reviled, Repudiated (A Response to Susan Henking's Analysis of Mary Daly's Thought)," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), pp. 208-209.

²² Paul C. Vitz and Evelyn Birge Vitz, "Pretentious, Preposterous, Pathetic: A Response to Susan Henking and to Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), pp. 210-216.

²³ Virginia K. Hearn, "Metapatriarchy: Mary Daly Re-viewed: A Response to Susan Henking," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), pp. 217-222.

female and the Biophilic woman. Then I will scrutinize Daly's analysis in light of the work of the German American psychoanalyst, Karen Horney, in order to determine how able a psychological theorist Mary Daly is. Vitz and Vitz, for all their vitriol against Daly, acknowledge Karen Horney's contribution to the development of feminist psychology.²⁴ However, I believe that their concern that "Daly entertains public audiences by blaspheming the Holy Spirit."²⁵ may well cloud their judgement about her feminist psychological theoretical achievement.

2.3 Daly's Psychological Paradigm

Daly has a tripartite psychological paradigm. Since she frequently describes the patriarchal male as sadistic, I will refer to that part of her paradigm as the sadistic patriarchal male. Since the patriarchal female is most often described as masochistic, I will refer to that part of her paradigm as the masochistic patriarchal female. The final part of the paradigm is named in accordance with Daly's predominant adjective for the psychologically healthy woman, the Biophilic woman.

a) The Sadistic Patriarchal Male

Daly presents the sadistic patriarchal male in two closely related guises: the religious clerical male and his secular successor. For the most part the religious clerical male is Roman Catholic, and his most frequently targeted successor belongs to one of the mental health professions - psychiatry, psychoanalysis, psychology, and or psychotherapy. However, the clergy

²⁴ Vitz and Vitz, p. 211. "If a feminist psychology is to develop, it must have its own concepts. Karen Horney (1967) and Carol Gilligan (1982), for example, have made intelligent contributions to such a feminist psychology. But Daly proposes nothing of this type." There is some irony here. Horney was ostracized from mainstream American psychoanalysis when she broke with Freudian orthodoxy and her work, when reviewed by that group, was usually trivialized, her popularity with the American public being considered a sign of an academic lightweight. Meanwhile her theory was gradually incorporated into mainstream psychoanalytic writing without being acknowledged. Daly, too, has been ostracized by her academic group for much the same reasons. It will be interesting to see how much of her theory will be adopted by the orthodox theology of the future.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 213.

of all religions are included in Daly's sweep, as are all the professions within patriarchy. Daly sums up her position as follows:

*Patriarchy is itself the prevailing religion of the entire planet, and its essential message is necrophilia. All of the so-called religions legitimating patriarchy are mere sects subsumed under its vast umbrella/canopy. These are essentially similar, despite the variations. All- from buddhism and hinduism to islam, judaism, christianity, to secular derivatives such as freudianism, jungianism, marxism, and maoism- are infrastructures of the edifice of patriarchy.*²⁶

Since Daly's most pervasive description of the patriarchal male is that of the Roman Catholic male cleric, I will use him to represent all those males included in this aspect of her psychological paradigm.²⁷

The key vehicle for the expression of clerical sadism is the Church's teachings.²⁸ These teachings include descriptions of the human nature of women, the nature and role of Mary, and the nature and role of God. They also include ethical teachings, and teachings about the nature and role of ritual. Daly also shows how the Church uses these teachings to secure the hatred of women in secular society.

(i) The Nature of Women

In *The Church and the Second Sex* Daly writes that the Church describes women as inferior and especially sinful. As well, the Church symbolically idealizes women in order to keep them in their place. This is deceptively called the "divine plan."²⁹ This symbolic idealization takes the form of the eternal feminine syndrome which results in the embedding of the masochistic

²⁶ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 39.

²⁷ I refer the reader to Chapter 1.3a for a general review of the many faces of the patriarchal male.

²⁸ Daly believes that the Roman Catholic Church masks its misogyny through deceptive teaching, and that this teaching is hypocritical and sadistic. See *The Church and the Second Sex*, pages 58 and 64.

²⁹ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, pages 53, 157 ff.

response in women. Because the eternal feminine is an ahistorical, immutable symbol, the status quo remains above questioning.³⁰ In the eternal feminine-divine plan scenario, only women are to be submissive, meek, and obedient,³¹ since it is natural for them to be this way because of their inferior brain.³² Combined with the notion of women's special sinfulness, this notion of women's inferiority "made it seem that the sociological fact of women's subordination was inscribed in the heavens."³³ The dichotomizing of women as either virgins (forever inferior and feminine) or whores (especially sinful) enslaves the former in the family, Daly writes, in order "to keep the patriarchy intact." Prostitutes, however, Daly notes, also serve the patriarchy. According to Augustine and Thomas Aquinas they preserve the patriarchy from debauchery.³⁴ Whether eternally feminine and inferior or especially sinful, only women are punished for infidelity.³⁵ The Church's hierarchical male structure with its male god further imprints inferiority onto the female psyche.³⁶ Daly asserts that the selective use of scriptural passages from both the Hebrew and Christian scriptures, as in following the 'J' tradition in the Hebrew scriptures with its story of 'the Fall' that purports both woman's immutable inferiority and her sole responsibility for evil in the world, rather than the 'P' tradition with its more balanced view of men and women both created in the image of God as equals to care for creation is deliberate and sadistic.³⁷ Daly believes that

³⁰ Ibid., 147 ff.

³¹ Ibid., p. 54.

³² Ibid., pp. 61, 82.

³³ Ibid., p. 63.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 63.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 64.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 65.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 75 ff. Daly picks up and expands her thinking about the Church's sadistic use of the Hebrew story of the Fall in *Beyond God the Father*, pages 45 ff. Women, born of men, cause men's misery. She sees the misogynist fixation on women's evil and men's innocence as a huge obstacle to psychological wholeness. She goes so far as to say that the mutual self-hatred that these beliefs engender cripple "the basic desire and need to communicate with others and so foster hatred, oppression, and even war." (p. 46). As well, Daly believes that this

the Church's teaching about women creates women, who, because of psychic and social deprivations become, in many instances, inferior beings.

Daly lists the churchmen throughout history who perpetuate the myth of women's special sinfulness and inferiority: Jerome blames women for the Fall and promotes a sado-masochistic marital model; Tertullian teaches that the devil enters the world through women; Clement believes that women should be ashamed of their nature; Augustine names woman a man-tempter; Bonaventure claims that women are the inferior part of the soul and Thomas Aquinas believes they are misbegotten males. Medieval canon law allows husbands to beat their wives; Ignatius Loyola teaches that women and Satan have much in common; the popes of the twentieth century call for subordinate, servile, obedient and docile women and several lobby in the political arena to have their teachings enshrined in the secular legal systems of the West.³⁸ Daly sees the Church of the present century as the "last stronghold of anachronism and prejudice..."³⁹ against women.

(ii) Nature and Role of Mary

Daly describes the pseudo-glorification of the Virgin Mary, "who is glorified only in accepting the subordinate role assigned to her,"⁴⁰ as the supreme misogynist victory. The Church's teaching about Mary reinforces its teaching about women's immutable inferiority and contributes to women's masochism.⁴¹ Churchmen like Augustine see Mary as the only redeemable woman, which Daly is inclined to interpret as a cover for men's misogyny and their

sadistic projection of evil onto women is the "primordial lie" making women the "primordial scapegoats." (p. 47). a role mothers are socialized to pass on to their daughters, (pp. 149-150).

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 76-82.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 54.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 61.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 62.

projection of their own sexual weaknesses onto women.⁴² Daly believes that the clerical creation of Mary as the model of women serves their misogyny very well as churchmen can turn to Mary whenever they are tempted by real women, who are neither static, controllable, or easy to deal with. Mary offers no competition, and is entirely at the disposal of her male creator.⁴³ Daly believes that the clerical attempt to see Mary and all women as symbolic objects is “fundamentally an egotistical and hostile act.”⁴⁴

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly writes that the images of Jesus and Mary serve to perpetuate a divided self in both women and men; the former allowing men to idealize themselves as good and superior while projecting their inferior aspects onto women, the latter encouraging women to masochistically take on the passive scapegoat aspect of Jesus and the passive subordination of Mary while projecting all that is of value in themselves onto men. Because Mary is beyond being successfully imitated by women, women, in reality, are identified with the denigrated image of Eve.⁴⁵ Daly believes that the male psychological ploy of idealizing women in the person of Mary “deflect[s] female outrage and inhibit[s] insight and hope.”⁴⁶ The doctrines of the Immaculate Conception, 1854, and the Assumption, 1952, are deceptive papal strategies to appease women whom the Church was simultaneously suppressing.⁴⁷

In *Gyn Ecology* Daly pursues her deconstruction of Marian doctrines seeing the ‘Virgin Birth’ as a convenient patriarchal demonstration of woman’s unimportance in the birth act, and as

⁴² Ibid., p. 88.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 160 ff.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 161.

⁴⁵ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, pp. 81-82.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 82.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 87 ff.

a “total erasure/elimination of female presence, which is replaced by male femininity.”⁴⁸ As for the Assumption, a catatonic, “dutifully dull and derivative, drained of divinity...”⁴⁹ Mary is a patriarchal construct that does not threaten patriarchal hegemony.

In *Pure Lust* Daly comes back again to these doctrines even more fiercely. The Virgin Birth is seen by her as an example of vaporized male rape and she points out that “Like all rape victims in male myth [Mary] submits joyously to this unspeakable degradation.”⁵⁰ For Daly, Mary represents all matter and the Incarnation represents the rape of all matter, which is accelerated by the computerized technology of “Nuclearism, chemical contamination of the earth, planned famine, torture of political prisoners, torture of laboratory animals, obscene medical examination - all are discharges of male instinctual energy through activities that are socially approved by males.”⁵¹ Daly observes that the fetal imagery concomitant with the image of the Virgin Mary is a consolation for misogynist men of all ages who want to be safe in women’s wombs, feeding off them. The more fetal men are, the more degraded women are.⁵²

Daly posits that male hatred of female power is obvious in the myth of the Immaculate Conception. Mary “was purified of autonomous be-ing before ever experiencing even an instant of this...In this pornographic mythic mirror-world, the son totals his virgin-mother-victim.”⁵³ Daly adds that with this doctrine the Church pretends to put women on a pedestal and thus exemplifies how much theology has in common with pornography: the former is rape of the mind,

⁴⁸ Daly, *Gyn·Ecology*, p. 87.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁵⁰ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 74.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 83-85.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

the latter, rape of the body.⁵⁴ As well, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception begins the age of female tokenism. Patriarchy sadistically allows a token inclusion of women in the professions and uses these women to destroy their independent sisters. “Like Mary [these women have] been prepared to assent to the spiritual rape that will reproduce the myth of male divinity.”⁵⁵ Daly sees the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary as nothing more than a cover up for the misogynist male assumption of female powers and male necrophilia. The dogma and the atomic bomb came to fruition around the same time: both are artificial products that declare that death is not death.⁵⁶

(iii) Nature and Role of God

Daly observes in *The Church and the Second Sex* that the doctrine about God is alienating, and disclaimers about God not being male, to the contrary, the maleness of God is subtly maintained thus lowering women’s self-esteem.⁵⁷ The static nature of God is replicated in the desire for a static status quo on Earth precluding the changes that social justice demands in the status of women and other oppressed groups.

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly reminds her readers how the patriarchal Father God in heaven works to sustain the privileged status of his sons on Earth.⁵⁸ She moves on to credit patriarchy’s ambivalent Father God, who is both loving and jealous, for the contradiction between the religious rhetoric of love and religion’s sadistic history of violence and its support of violence.⁵⁹ She describes the patriarchal God as an externalized and an internalized image of male

⁵⁴ Ibid., note p. 108.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 110.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 124 ff.

⁵⁷ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 180 ff.

⁵⁸ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 13.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 16 ff.

superiority, and along with the images of the patriarchal God as explanation, judge and definer of sin these images serve as the misogynist strategy of God's sons to maintain in women "false consciousness and self-destructive guilt feelings."⁶⁰ In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly writes of the all-male trinity of Christianity as a metaphor for the quintessentially homoerotic procession of male self-absorption and deception, the mono-gendering of men that is choking the world.⁶¹

Daly also believes that patriarchal Christology presents a special problem for women. Like Jesus, women are reified and used as scapegoats.⁶² Unlike Jesus, women lack the prestige of being male like him, therefore God like him. Daly sees the myths of sin and salvation as two symptoms of the same disease that has resulted in the misogynist dislocation of evil from its origins in patriarchy to the persons of women. In as much as the use of the image of Jesus serves to keep men and women locked into their sado-masochistic postures of self-glorification and self-abnegation respectively, the image of Jesus as God is no longer helpful. Jesus as scapegoat inspires hatred of the other. Males who claim to be made in his image, because they are males like him, are unable to face their own deficient image and therefore project it sadistically onto women. Once the male has projected his deficiency unto women, he works to destroy that image. Denigrating and idealizing women in the same breath has assured the men of patriarchal religions a ready and permanent scapegoat.

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly paints a more drastic picture of a Jesus who "assimilates/devours the Goddess...The 'gentle Jesus' who offers the faithful his body to eat and his blood to drink..."⁶³ is masking the fetal patriarchal male who wishes to devour women alive. However this vampirism is

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁶¹ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, pp. 37-39.

⁶² Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 75 ff.

⁶³ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 81. See also *Pure Lust*, p. 74.

only a transitional step toward the elimination of the goddess and women altogether.

Protestantism's presentation of an androgynous Christ, who in Daly's opinion is the "Supreme Swinging Single...a unisex model, whose sex is male."⁶⁴ eliminates women altogether and becomes "male femininity incarnate."⁶⁵

In *Pure Lust* Daly cites some rather gruesome stories of clerical Christology that inspire, indeed seem to demand masochistic acts on the part of women, as in Margaret Mary Alogue's consumption of a patient's excrement with an immediate reward from Christ and later Church approval.⁶⁶ Daly's belief that the revelation to Alogue of the Sacred Heart which is really a code for the phallus prepares the reader for her next leap, her new understanding of the Incarnation as the "Purest Peep Show of the millennia, a male-identified counterfeit lesbian love scene issuing in male offspring."⁶⁷ The lesbian love scene is kindness of "The transexed, broken spirit of the Goddess, guised as the holy ghost, rap[ing] the broken dis-spirited matter of the Goddess (Mary)."⁶⁸ Daly interprets all this as "the ultimate in sadospiritual speculation...the usurpation of female power...the legitimat[ion of] the rape of all matter."⁶⁹ That is, the rape of all women and the earth.

For Daly, the eucharist is cannibalism, the crucifix a sadomasochistic fantasy, and sacramental confession a matter of voyeurism. Daly cites these Christological doctrines as examples of disguised male lust.⁷⁰ Further, the crucified word is the subliminal crucifixion of

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 88. See also *Pure Lust*, p. 93.

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 88.

⁶⁶ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 58.

⁶⁷ Ibid. pp. 130-131.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 130.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 131.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 74.

female words and meaning. And the Christian salvation myth of Jesus' coming to suffer, die, and save men from their sins disguises the necrophilic final cause of the patriarchal doctrine-makers for whom it is unthinkable that Jesus could have come "to be joyous and to live because life is good...For the rulers of these sadospheres require sickness, suffering, poverty, depression, immobility, guilt and basic breakdown of integrity to be the norm."⁷¹

(iv) Ethical Teachings

Daly points out early in *The Church and the Second Sex* that the Church only punishes women for marital and sexual infidelity⁷², and that this double standard is solely for the benefit of its male creators.⁷³ In *Beyond God the Father* Daly posits that patriarchal morality, which was meant to curb the excesses of men, is essentially ignored by men and absorbed by and misogynistically demanded of women.⁷⁴ She believes that the virtues of charity, meekness, obedience, humility, self-abnegation and service would have gone a long way to alleviate the sadistic male oppression of women, had men chosen to practise them. She sees more duplicity in the male condemnation of women as evil and their simultaneous declaration that women are not morally capable.⁷⁵

The Church's teaching on abortion is yet another example of ethical duplicity because the Church fails to acknowledge that abortion is a product of patriarchal society and its real creators, men, are in no way held responsible for any aspect of their creation.⁷⁶ Added to this is the clerical

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 132.

⁷² Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 54.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 64.

⁷⁴ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 100 ff.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 101.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 109 ff.

counselling to which raped women seeking abortion are exposed, adding psychic rape to the physical rape already endured. Daly argues further that because the mentality of rape is a feature of the Jewish and Christian heritage, the Church is unable to name its own complicity with oppressive political powers, and its own role in rape, genocide and war.⁷⁷

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly returns to her discussion of Christian virtues. This time, however, the discussion centres on the seven deadly sins disguised as virtues: the pride of male professionals who mystify knowledge; the avarice of male possessiveness that possesses women's energy politically, economically, and mythically; the violence of the male naming of aggressiveness as anger to cover up the male view that woman is 'the enemy'; the lust of male obsessiveness that results in genital fixation and gender role stereotyping that legitimates patriarchal rule; the gluttony of assimilation that feeds on token women's energy; the envy in the male elimination of self-identified women; and the sloth of the male enslavement of women in menial labour.⁷⁸

Daly continues her discussion of the Christian virtues in *Pure Lust*. She asserts that the clergy are devoid of understanding when it comes to understanding the misogynist evils of patriarchal religion.⁷⁹ Prudence, which demands "an intuitively right estimate of some particular end,"⁸⁰ is disregarded since patriarchal religion never questions the ends in which its teachings result. The obedience, tractability and submissiveness of the virtue of docility are only prescribed for women. Reason is the correct application of universal principles to particular situations. In patriarchal religion this becomes the kind of deception that moves from the universal evil of women to the moral correctness of gynocide. Justice, which is seen by the clerical male as a

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 114 ff.

⁷⁸ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, pp. 30-31.

⁷⁹ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 260 ff.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 266.

commodity to be gained rather than a state to be created is used to bully women into taking back abusive and rapist husbands. Courage is sadistically bred out of women under the guise of patriarchal protection that insists on female submissiveness, and that idealizes male-identified accomplished women as the standard of courage to which women should aspire. The intemperance of patriarchy is expressed in the sexual abuse and violence of men toward women.

Patriarchal religious myths legitimate the destruction of women as evil and offer pseudoesCAPES in thought-killing reversals and 'love bombing'. In Christianity there is a "constant flow of rhetoric about 'love' of god and neighbor - a bombardment of verbiage which often replaces/displaces any signs or acts of genuine biophilic concern."⁸¹ The sadistic Christian requirement of love for the oppressor easily becomes love of the oppressor, and degenerates into a need for the oppressed in order that there be someone to 'love.'

In sum, the clerical ethics that are claimed as God's will, make the oppression of women God's will and all that is good and natural in women, evil.

(v) Nature and Role of Rituals

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly investigates the reinforcement of patriarchal myths through rituals.⁸² The sexist rituals of the Roman Catholic Church constantly reinforce the 'vicious lie' at the heart of patriarchy, that women are responsible for evil in the world. She points out that the Church's blessing of soldiers, war, and torture makes this violence appear "sane". She writes, "To persons in whom the effects of socialization so overwhelm critical judgement that their sense of reality is co-extensive with the world legitimated by religious myth

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 326.

⁸² Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, pages 140ff, 195 ff.

and ritual, the 'reasonableness' of even the most bizarre and violent events thus legitimated seems unquestionable."⁸³ Daly posits that people who see through this religious masking of violence and who try to uncover it, are seen, conveniently by those unmasked, as deviant or mentally ill. In the past, they were executed as heretics.

Daly believes that patriarchal religion is desperately shielding itself, with its rituals, against anomie, and the resulting precarious link with reality is what motivates it to irrational dogmatism. She believes that women are silenced in this scenario so that men can "chant [their] own eternal dreary dirge to a past that never was."⁸⁴

Patriarchal religious rituals also create false needs in women which in turn create masochistic dependency and submissiveness. Daly counsels women who have freed themselves from patriarchy to avoid recreating their bondage in rituals, which she sees as a product of the compulsion to repeat; a compulsion that changes nothing. Women must see that patriarchal rituals are eternal circles of return, whether it is the repetitive eucharistic liturgy, or any other reliance on repeating the past to close the present and the future. As well, these rituals construct women to be mirrors to reflect back to men their self-aggrandized selves. Eve is born of Adam, baptism is a greater birth than physical birth, the eucharist is the most important meal, penance and baptisms are the real washing, confirmation the real strengthening, and extreme unction the true consolation. The male-mother clergy even adopt women's dress and finery. All this, Daly says, is to ensure that the sons of God are in the most important sense only the sons of other sons of God. Finally, Daly challenges the patriarchal belief that the Church is a sacred space, set apart. For her, it is a patriarchal place of escape from reality, and thus a place of false transcendence.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 142.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 150.

In her later books, Daly develops her reflections on the psychological impact of ritual under the rubric of the “Sado Ritual Syndrome.” This syndrome will be reviewed in the next section.

(vi) The Psychological Impact of the Church’s Misogynist Teaching on Religious and Secular Society

In *The Church and the Second Sex*.⁸⁵ Daly observes that the Church dichotomizes women as virgins and whores in its eternal feminine doctrine. She believes that this dichotomizing is the result of the clerical repression of certain unwanted feelings, sexual lust for example, and their subsequent projection onto women as feelings only experienced by women. Thus women are forced to carry all the feelings that clerics think are beneath them as sons of God, and they are forced to achieve all of the moral virtues clerics pretend to have achieved and have declared that women are incapable of achieving. Daly writes, continuing her use of psychoanalytic theory, that the success of the projection rests on women, as the objects of the projections, internalizing the projected material and experiencing it as natural to themselves. This allows the projecting persons, in this case the clergy, to claim that all that they are describing (about the victims of their projections) is quite obviously natural to those victims. The failure of the Church to address this sadistic pathology that it has created makes it, in Daly’s view, an ally of the powers of darkness. She believes that the eternal feminine stereotype makes all people losers because it has become the neurosis of the whole culture.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 166 ff.

⁸⁶ Daly’s use of the mechanism of projection is consistent throughout her work, and could be said to form the core of her psychological understanding of the sadistic-masochistic relationship between patriarchal men and women. See, for example, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 33: “The dichotomizing-reifying-projecting syndrome has been

Daly writes that androcentricism and misogyny are part of the structure of theology. She uses the disease model to make her point. "Theology is comparable to an organism: a disease affecting one part quickly spreads to another part. Moreover, it is not enough to cure a symptom. In fact, instant cures of surface manifestations might simply disguise the fact that the disease is still present at a deeper level, ready to manifest itself in other forms."⁸⁷

Daly observes that the doctrine about God is alienating, and disclaimers about God's not being male to the contrary, the maleness of God is subtly maintained, thus lowering women's self-esteem. The static nature of God is replicated in the desire for a static status quo on Earth precluding the changes in the status of women and other oppressed groups that social justice demands. There is a failure to see that the obsession with sin and sexuality, which women are made to represent, is warped and responsible for the view that women are to be subordinate in marriage and never ordained because they are not male.

At the close of *The Church and the Second Sex*, Daly writes an astute psychological summary of the problem that the eternal feminine position of the Church causes for everyone in the Church, and of the sado-masochistic consequences that will persist if the Church does not reform itself around this issue. In subsequent texts, she expands upon this paradigmatic psychological position.

We have seen...that the disease can be understood as a self-fulfilling prophecy, a process by which the dominant class projects its unwanted characteristics, its lower self, upon the members of the oppressed class, who in turn introject the despised qualities...Moreover, the workings of the process - the whole vicious circle of role psychology - are understood neither by the oppressor nor his victim, both of whom are inclined to accept the myths, such as the myth of fixed natures, which serves as

characteristic of patriarchal consciousness, making 'the other' the repository of the lost self."; the Sado Ritual Syndrome presented in *Gyn/Ecology*, page 136 ff. exists to destroy the projected male image; the pseudo passions and virtues presented in *Pure Lust* exist to imprison women in the projected male image.

⁸⁷ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 179.

its justification.

If the resultant fixed roles were harmful only to the class of persons who have been made inferior (the slave, the Negro, the woman) there would be compelling enough reason to seek a cure. However, there is more to it than this. The white supremacist is rent at the core of his being. Thus also the male, through the mutilation of the woman, has been caught in a process of self-destruction. In relation to woman as mother, wife, companion, he is doomed to frustration if he cannot find in the other an authentic, self-activating person - with precisely the qualities which are stunted by the imposition of the eternal feminine. Fated to partnership with 'true woman,' he may find this dissociated, narcissistic being less satisfactory than the companion of his dreams. What is more, the 'eternal masculine' itself is alienating, crippling the personalities of men and restricting their experience of life at every level. The male in our society is not supposed to express much feeling, sensitivity, aesthetic appreciation, imagination, consideration of others, intuition. He is expected to affirm only part of his real self. Indeed, it may be that a good deal of the compulsive competitiveness of males is rooted in this half experience.

It is the nature of the disease, therefore, to inhibit the expansion of the individual's potential, through conditioned conformity to roles, and through a total identification of the individual with them. It contrasts starkly with free acceptance of the roles by integrated personalities, for its effect is to hinder the integration of personality.⁸⁸

Between the writing of *The Church and the Second Sex* and *Beyond God the Father*, Daly adds a few more pieces to her psychological paradigm that illustrate the psychological damage clerical strategies have on women in the Church and in the world. She names four defensive strategies that clerical males use in reacting to the just demands of women. They avoid seeing the problem, and if by chance they do see it, they trivialize it. They particularize the problem by suggesting that the subordination of women is only a Roman Catholic problem. Or they

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 193-194. See the following articles written after *The Church and the Second Sex* that reiterate this view: "Mary Daly and the Second Sex," Interview by E. Marion, *U.S. Catholic* 34 (Spring 1968), pp. 21-22; "Women and the Catholic Church," In *Sisterhood is Powerful*, ed. Robin Morgan (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 125, 128, 133; "After the Death of God the Father," *Commonweal* 94 (1972), pp. 7-9; "The Courage to See," *The Christian Century* 88 (1971), pp. 1109-1111; "The Church and Women: An Interview With Mary Daly," Ed. L.I. Stell, *Theology Today* 28 (1971), pp. 349-352; "The Woman's Movement: An Exodus Community," *Religious Education* 67 (1972), pages 327-328, 331-332; "Abortion and Sexual Caste," *Commonweal* 95 (1972), pp. 415-416; "The Spiritual Revolution: Women's Liberation as Theological Re-Education," *Andover-Newton Quarterly* 12 (1972), pp. 164-172; "A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion," *The Unitarian Universalist Christian* 27 (1972), pages 29-32, 34.

eschatologize the problem: at the end of time there will be neither male nor female. Or finally, they universalize the problem positing that “‘The real problem is *human* liberation.’”⁸⁹ Daly also underlines the misogynist tokenism in the Church and outside it, a tokenism that co-opts and objectifies women into the patriarchal structures that program them to be at the service of men.⁹⁰ As well, Daly observes that psychoanalysis, with its mostly male practitioners, is the new power that has taken over the psychological intimidation of women from the traditional religions. She writes:

Psychoanalysis has its own creeds, priesthood, spiritual counselling, its rules, anathemas, and jargon. Its power of intimidation is enormous. Millions who might smile at being labelled ‘heretic’ or ‘sinful’ for refusing to conform to the norms of sexist society can be cowed and kept in line by the labels ‘sick,’ ‘neurotic,’ or ‘unfeminine.’ This Mother Church of contemporary secular patriarchal religions has sent missionaries everywhere, not excluding the traditional churches themselves.⁹¹

A final sadistic strategy noted during this time is psychological scapegoating, or blaming the victim: bad things happen to women because they “ask for it.”⁹²

Daly points out in *Beyond God the Father* that the myth of the Fall encourages men to project their self-hatred outward onto women, and encourages women to internalize their own self-hatred and that of men, causing women to be victimized not only by men, but by themselves

⁸⁹ Daly, “The Courage to See,” p. 1108. See also “The Women’s Movement: An Exodus Community,” p. 329; and “The Spiritual Revolution: Women’s Liberation as Theological Re-Education,” pp. 164-165, and *Pure Lust*, p. 320 ff. in which Daly changes her nomenclature slightly: trivialization becomes depreciation as Daly has reclaimed trivia and its derivatives for women. Her examples are also updated for the first two defence mechanisms: depreciation of women’s abilities; particularization becoming one issue feminism.

⁹⁰ See “The Church and Women,” pages 329, 331-332; “A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion,” pages 29, 34; and “The Spiritual Revolution: Women’s Liberation as Theological Re-Education,” pp. 175-176.

⁹¹ Daly, “The Women’s Movement: An Exodus Community,” p. 331. See also “Abortion and Caste,” p. 417, and “Spiritual Revolution: Women’s Liberation as Theological Re-Education,” pages 169-170, 172.

⁹² See “A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion,” p. 33. Daly picks up this theme in *Beyond God the Father* pages 60-62, 75-84, outlining some of the Church’s abuses of women (witch, misbegotten male and the secular extension of those views by those in the mental health professions) that will be more fully treated in *Gyn/Ecology* and *Pure Lust*.

and other women.⁹³ With such a divided self, women remain silent when they should speak; they live vicariously through men; and they work to suppress other women who would free themselves of patriarchal pathology. Patriarchal religion reinforces women's self-hatred by teaching that male contempt of them is justified by God.⁹⁴

Reversal is another misogynist psychological strategy employed by men to mythologize and maintain their superiority.⁹⁵ The clergy write that woman, Eve, is born of man, Adam. They declare that women are misbegotten men, whereas biology proves the reverse is true. Men steal women's ideas and pass them off as their own.⁹⁶ Even the mythology of male incarnation for salvation is a reversal because patriarchal males who are imaged as redeemers in this myth in reality have no desire to be redeemed. And the clerical mythology of the Antichrist, whom Daly sees as the Biophilically liberated woman, is a reversal, preventing patriarchal men from facing their projected images of themselves.

Daly comments on the sadistic quality of psychological healing available to women in the Church.⁹⁷ It is delivered largely at the hands of clerical males and it fuels and perpetuates illness, in part by the dichotomy of healer and patient. Daly believes that the clerical healers are themselves sick and need to be exposed as such.⁹⁸

⁹³ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 44 ff.

⁹⁴ Quoting Karen Horney, Daly remarks that men's denigration of women is rooted in their "'underlying fear and dread of women...'" See Karen Horney, *Feminine Psychology*, ed. Harold Kelman (New York: W.W.Norton, 1967), p. 136, quoted in Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 92. Daly adds (pp. 92-93) that "A quasi-infinite catalogue could be compiled of quotes from male leaders of 'civilization' revealing this universal dread - expressed sometimes as loathing, sometimes as belittling ridicule, sometimes as patronizing contempt."

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-97.

⁹⁶ See Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them* (Boston: Pandora, 1988).

⁹⁷ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 161 ff.

⁹⁸ See also *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 9 ff. Daly accuses all male professional healers, including priests, of iatrogenic, or healer caused diseases, especially bent on women's destruction.

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly continues to describe the clerical projection and its impact under the rubric of the Sado Ritual Syndrome.⁹⁹ This syndrome has seven elements. Men are obsessed with women's sexual purity having projected onto them their own lust; this projection usually results in the erasure of women as witnesses most often through murder and maiming, as in suttee, witchburning, widow burning, footbinding, and unnecessary psychological and gynaecological surgical intervention. Secondly, the male ensures that his identity as the agent of projection is erased, allowing God, tradition, or some higher authority to take responsibility for acts that the private or personal self of the male might find frightening and evil. Thirdly, patriarchal males tend to quickly adopt these projected sadistic solutions, usually through the class structure, from the elite to the downtrodden. Fourthly, they hide their agency through the use of women as token torturers and scapegoats. Fifthly, they are compulsively meticulous and repetitive, fixed on the minutest detail as a form of distraction from the horror of their misogynist deeds. Sixthly, having ritualized the solution to the hated projection, males simultaneously make their behaviour appear and become normative. Finally, patriarchal male scholars legitimate this pathology through unquestioned assumptions, misnamed practices, and glorification of the horrid.

Daly's psychological understanding of the Sado Ritual Syndrome is that the repetition of these rituals subtly, over time, make the participants complicit. The repetition "trains both victims and victimizers to perform uncritically their preordained roles. Thus the psyches of the performers are conditioned so that they become carriers and perpetrators of patriarchal myth."¹⁰⁰ The myth of female evil is embedded in the ritual and reinforced each time the ritual is enacted. Patriarchal scholars become apologists for misogynist patriarchal practices, often using language

⁹⁹ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 135 ff.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

that deliberately obfuscates the goal of the ritual which is to destroy women, making it sound like the women are volunteering, honestly confessing, and that men are acting justly to save women's honour. She believes that a wedge is hammered between the personal self and the ritual self causing a schizoid perception that allows men to identify with the rite rather than with the victim. Their blaming the victim and identifying with the aggressor further imperils women.

Daly turns to sadospirituality in *Pure Lust*, citing it as a pathological characteristic of the patriarchal male.¹⁰¹ She describes it as an obsessive pseudoasceticism that involves sensory deprivation and that blocks Participation in Be-ing. Daly cites the Sadospiritual Syndrome in which men flee from their lust into a transformed lechery that includes misogynist sadomasochistic obsessive behaviour. Daly also detects reversals at work, like those seen in the Sado Ritual Syndrome, that render filth pure, and that glorify the gory sadomasochism of patriarchal heroes. Daly comments on three such sadospiritual heroes: Ghandi, T.E. Lawrence, and Dag Hammarskjöld. Daly believes that Ghandi raped women spiritually, using them for his own ego; that Lawrence forever punished himself for his homosexual response of pleasure that occurred when he was raped by Turks, and like Ghandi he was obsessively testing himself to see if he had arrived at sexual purity. Hammarskjöld believed in the negation of self and was fascinated with suicide. Daly found him possessed by a tedious narcissism.

Following closely on the heels of this indictment, is her charge that theology and pornography are intimately linked, because both arrogantly promulgate deception. The lie in the latter is that women want force, rape and all other male abuse.¹⁰² The lie in the former is that both society and the Church create false guilt in women leading to masochism. She thinks both

¹⁰¹ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 35 ff.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 55 ff.

have created methods to relieve the guilt: misogynist psychotherapeutic and sacramental confession. Daly finds patriarchal males to be obsessed with women's confessions, sadosubliming themselves into God, becoming reified beings with masks that they use and need to pretend to be what they are not in order to keep clients subordinate and in awe.¹⁰³

Daly parodies the Pope whom she calls the Great Mother, the Visiting Queen of Heaven, and whose role as such impacts negatively on the well being of women: "the papal mother functions to legitimate the age of nuclearism, not by favoring nuclear holocaust, but by fostering woman-hating ideologies, myths, roles, rules which undermine respect for life (while assuming the title 'pro-life')." ¹⁰⁴

Daly believes that Christian preaching is unctuous, and that its unctuous intonations sadistically suck women into guilt and fear, and batter their brains by monopolizing and monitoring the air waves "to such an extent that even a few fleeting seconds of such routinized intoning/droning constitute an injection of depression, a sense of banality and boredom."¹⁰⁵

Finally, in the "New Archaic Afterwords" added to the 1985 reissue of *The Church and the Second Sex* Daly writes about a protection racket syndrome. In exchange for loyalty to one male, women are protected from other raping males. The parallel in religion is: in exchange for loyalty to one mind-raping patriarchal religion, a woman is protected from the other mind-raping religions.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 73 ff.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 406.

¹⁰⁶ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. xxi ff.

b) The Masochistic Patriarchal Woman

Daly hints at the characteristics of masochistic patriarchal women in her first three books, giving the most extensive presentation in *Pure Lust*. In *The Church and the Second Sex* Daly writes of the masochistic patriarchal woman as obedient, submissive and meek,¹⁰⁷ and as inferior, subordinate, dependent and ignorant.¹⁰⁸ Daly believes that through the patriarchal perpetuation of the eternal feminine syndrome¹⁰⁹ the masochistic response is embedded in women. What a woman can truly become and what the immutable symbol says a woman can become are inextricably confused and confusing.¹¹⁰ The patriarchal woman sees herself as privileged to be self-sacrificing and hidden, a selfless mother even to her husband.¹¹¹ Daly blames the masochistic response on the projection mechanism used so skilfully by the patriarchal male to convince his female counterpart that in herself she is nothing of value, but rather a curse.¹¹²

In *Beyond God the Father* Daly claims that sadistic male projections create “false consciousness and self-destructive guilt feelings.”¹¹³ in the women who introject them. She also believes that the projection mechanism makes patriarchal women “the repository of the lost [male] self.”¹¹⁴ Religious myths, like the Fall, encourage men to project their self-hatred outward onto women, and encourage women to internalize their own self-hatred and that of men, causing women to be victimized not only by men, but by themselves and other women. With such a divided self women remain silent when they should speak; they live vicariously through men; and

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 76.

¹⁰⁹ See above. p.9.

¹¹⁰ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 81.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 82.

¹¹² See above pages 11, 14, 20-21, 23-25 for discussion of the mechanism of projection.

¹¹³ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, pp. 30-31.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 33.

they work to suppress other women who would free themselves from this patriarchal pathology. Daly believes that the 'original sin' of masochistic patriarchal women is their enforced complicity in their own oppression. She is careful here and in later work not to blame women for this state of affairs. At fault are the "demonic power structures which induce individuals to internalize false identities."¹¹⁵ Overall, patriarchal religion reinforces women's self-hatred teaching that male contempt of them is justified by God.¹¹⁶ Daly claims that women who have found peace within patriarchal religions have done so at a great psychological price, "leaping over inequalities instead of working them through."¹¹⁷ In an article that serves as a footnote to this text, Daly adds "diffuseness, dependence upon others for self-definition, low self-esteem, [and] powerlessness."¹¹⁸ to her description of the masochistic patriarchal woman.

In *Gyn/Ecology* Daly speaks of masochistic women as autoallergic, working toward their own self-destruction. Women's "false self possesses her genuine Self."¹¹⁹ Sedated by her sadistic patriarchal masters, patriarchal women turn against themselves and their sisters. Daly describes them as "The divided ones, the self-Selves, shelve or sell their Selves. They become ever-hardening shells of their Selves, suffocating their own process. They become iron masks, choking their own becoming, hiding their own knowing, substituting deception for know-ing."¹²⁰ Daly adds that the bonding of such women is binding, as in Chinese footbinding. Such bonded women are tame, domesticated, harnessed, meek, subdued, seduced, and disloyal to themselves and their

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 49.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 47-50.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 153.

¹¹⁸ Mary Daly, "Post-Christian Theology: Some Connections Between Idolatry and Methodolatry, Between Deicide and Methodicide," In *Women and Religion: 1973 Proceedings*, ed. J. Romero (Tallahassee: AAR, 1973), p. 37.

¹¹⁹ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 337.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 337.

sisters, having a false loyalty to their patriarchal masters instead. These women self-lobotomize, allowing their energy to be drained away.¹²¹

Daly's most detailed description of this aspect of her psychological paradigm is in *Pure Lust*. The masochistic woman's speech is shallow, polite, flattering of the male ego, denying of Self. Her anger is turned against herself and her sisters and it is paralyzing.¹²² Daly names this self destructiveness, "masosadism."¹²³ It "begins with doubting the validity of one's own be-ing - a doubt expressed as Self-hatred - and extends to doubting the validity of other women's be-ing."¹²⁴ The masosadistic woman is also radically passive, and unable and or unwilling to resist oppression against herself and other women. She is incapable of moral outrage. She is a token torturer of other women, feeding the "patriarchally embedded hatred of women in women."¹²⁵ Masosadistic token feminists make feminism feel like an illusion, driving women who are thus disillusioned back into the arms of patriarchal men. Their complicity in accepting a patriarchal false self destroys their core integrity. Daly writes, "In the society of sado-sublimation, pseudofeminism is also sadofeminism, the fathers' final solution to the problem of female be-ing."¹²⁶ In an increasingly conservative society, some women have an obsessive-compulsive need for safety, shelter, rules and love that plays right into the hands of the sadosociety by creating masosadistic women who damage themselves and each other for approval and protection.

In patriarchy, Daly explains, connections between masochistic women and other women and the elements are broken. Masochistic women suffer a chronic acute anger that immobilizes

¹²¹ Ibid., pages 338, 344-345.

¹²² Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 18.

¹²³ Ibid., p. 66 ff.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 59-60, *note.

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 111.

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 193.

and defeats them. They are victims of the Biggest Lies that condition them for patriarchal deceptions and dissociations, leaving them grateful for the few manipulative concessions granted by their patriarchal keepers, and they remain totally ignorant of themselves, the extent of their victimhood and what is rightfully theirs. Women who argue with the Pope in hope of a reasonable response are wasting their time on the perpetrator of the Biggest Lies. Women as mirrors of Sado-asceticism ingest a masochistic self-image that results in saintly masochism that “[has] spawned self-loathing, a need for punishment, [and] hatred of other women, a condition which results in horizontal violence.”¹²⁷

This masosadistic woman is annihilated and restored in the patriarchal image as a woman for men only, a fate for which she expresses endless gratitude.¹²⁸ The stereotypical images are “dispensed through sado-religion, psychology, pornography, fashions, films...television commercials/news/drama...”¹²⁹ Many women “attempt to erase their Selves in order to be spared...[they have a] realistic terror of recriminations for any refusal to comply with the stereotype.”¹³⁰ She compulsively confesses her failure to meet male expectations. She is obsessed with purification by confession, a posture which results in concealing the agent and horizontal violence against other women. The more a patriarchal woman confesses, the more righteous she feels in condemning other women. The patriarchal woman confesses to male-defined sins, an act of self-loathing that is rewarded by emotional catharsis and the relief of suppressed guilt feelings.¹³¹

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp. 57-58.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 130 ff.

¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 123.

¹³⁰ Ibid., pp. 139-140.

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 139 ff.

The masochistic woman's rage is plasticized into hostility and bitterness. The restored, fulfilled patriarchal woman is the ideal patriarchal object. "Because of her frustration and low self-image," Daly explains, "she craves romantic love and marriage, religion, professional help, alcohol and pills, and all kinds of man-made things."¹³² Daly claims that the pseudo, or plastic passions of patriarchy paralyze women into increased disconnectedness and fragmentation. She lists these man-made passions as : guilt, anxiety, depression, hostility, bitterness, resentment, frustration, boredom, resignation, and fulfillment. Because women can not name these masochistic emotions for what they are they can not break free of the patriarchy that created them and thus end up twisted in on themselves. Plastic passions render women resigned to their fate and craving male approval. Potted passions, a slightly mitigated version of the plastic ones, are no help either because they fragment and distort women's psyches, concealing real Passion. Daly writes,

Thus in the Cockocratic State women are intimidated, tracked, and trained to love, desire, and rejoice in the wrong things, hate, have aversion to and be sad over the wrong things...[potted passions are] like lies which are partial truths parading as the whole, they are substitutes for genuine e-motions, deceiving their subjects and those with whom they are connected in this deceptive way.¹³³

Daly sees a vacuum where the Self should be; feelings are only experienced indirectly and vicariously.

Women have internalized the raping, battering patriarchal male and this results in constant internal and external terror, which is constantly being reinforced by the multiple covert and overt sadistic messages that women should submit 'or else'. Daly concludes, "The forms of female

¹³² Ibid., p. 204.

¹³³ Ibid., p. 206.

behavior that our contemporary ideologues have called internalized self-hate or masochism are usually just a logical response to a man's gesture of dominance."¹³⁴

c) The Biophilic Woman

Throughout Daly's work the Biophilic woman undergoes some changes as Daly's stand hardens vis-à-vis the patriarchal male. In *The Church and the Second Sex* Daly writes of Biophilic women freeing themselves from all patriarchal stereotypes in order to show their own immense potential.¹³⁵ She believes the pathology that is patriarchy will be cured through "confrontation, dialogue, and co-operation between the sexes undreamed of in the past..."¹³⁶

In an article written in 1969, "The Return of the Protestant Principle," Daly develops further her description of the Biophilic woman. She must have a willingness to face meaninglessness and have a "tolerance of ambiguity." She must acknowledge that "there are no fixed, absolute 'answers' to ultimate questions and that there is no infallible authority to provide them [which] implies the acceptance of existential anxiety...[and the realization that] this is far from easy."¹³⁷

During the first half of the 1970's Daly's Biophilic woman was to be part of a self-actualizing diarchy with men, a player in an androgynous humanity.¹³⁸ These descriptors will be

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 243.

¹³⁵ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 84.

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 195.

¹³⁷ Mary Daly, "Return of the Protestant Principle," *Commonweal* 90 (1969), p. 339. See also "After the Death of God the Father," p. 9; "The Woman's Movement: An Exodus Community," p. 331; and "A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion," pages 24, 36.

¹³⁸ See "Women and the Church," p. 131; "After the Death of God the Father," p. 7; "The Courage to See," pp. 1109-1110; "The Church and Women," pp. 349, 351, 353; "The Woman's Movement: An Exodus Community," p.

abandoned as Daly realizes that androgyny swallows up the female in the male,¹³⁹ and as she concludes that the patriarchal male is not psychologically redeemable.¹⁴⁰

As Daly moves towards the publication of *Beyond God the Father*, she suggests that Biophilic women may need to put themselves outside patriarchal religion.¹⁴¹ She begins to speak of Biophilic women as a cognitive minority, and the resolution of patriarchal pathology for women taking place within the women's movement, which she describes as "a province of the mind -...[a] sacred space...of self-actualization and transcendence."¹⁴² Daly warns that this women's space should not be absolutized, nor should it become escapist. The women's movement, or Sisterhood, provides for the bonding of Biophilic women into a cognitive minority that Daly believes should be separate from men's organizations so that Biophilic women can find their own voices. This will be done through women naming things for themselves, through the expression of creative rage, and through the power of women being present to one another. There will also have to be a "transvaluation of values" from the patriarchal to the biophilic. Biophilic values include, during this period, love of the oppressor, and the refusal to victimize him.¹⁴³

Daly's Biophilic women become the liberators of humanity from patriarchy by the time of *Beyond God the Father*. Biophilic women must have the courage to move out of their

328: "Abortion and Sexual Caste," p. 416; "The Spiritual Revolution," pages 165-166, 175; "A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion," p. 24, and *Beyond God the Father*, passim.

¹³⁹ See *Gyn/Ecology*, pp. 387-388.

¹⁴⁰ See *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 27 ff.

¹⁴¹ See "After the Death of God the Father," p. 9. By the time she writes *Beyond God the Father*, Daly is counselling that a condition of biophilia is departure from all things patriarchal. See Chapter 5.

¹⁴² Daly, "The Spiritual Revolution," pp. 171-172. See also: "The Courage to See," p. 1110, and "Abortion and Sexual Caste," p. 418.

¹⁴³ See "The Woman's Movement: An Exodus Community," pages 327-329, 331-332; "The Courage to See," p. 1111; "The Church and Women," pp. 351-354; "Abortion and Sexual Caste," p. 417; "The Spiritual Revolution," pp. 166-168, 174; and "A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion," pages 24, 31, 33-34.

masochistic self-alienation, which patriarchy makes so comfortable for them, and become the Biophilic liberators of humanity in a “new phase in the human spirit’s quest for God.”¹⁴⁴ These women must have the existential courage to face non-being in order to become self-actualizing.¹⁴⁵ This self-actualization will involve “boldness, courage, freedom, spontaneity, perspicuity, integration and self-acceptance...[and] tend also to...clearer, more efficient perception of reality, more openness to experience, autonomy, detachment, recovery of creativeness, ability to fuse concreteness and abstractness, [and] democratic character structure.”¹⁴⁶ Biophilic women must participate in Be-ing and take that participation for their security and identity in place of their false patriarchal security and identity.¹⁴⁷ The resulting biophilic self-transcendence will help them to see that “all presently envisioned goals, lifestyles, symbols, and social structures may be transitory.” This should also free them from being idolatrous, or absolutizing “even in regard to one’s own cause...”¹⁴⁸ This Participation in Be-ing will allow Biophilic women to give up their role as “the other” and to affirm themselves, without making anyone else “the other.”¹⁴⁹ The location of this self-transcendence will be on the boundary of patriarchy, in a women-centred space that will be invisible and thus inviolable to everyone except the cognitive minority; a space where Biophilic women can express both their rage and their creativity.¹⁵⁰ Again Daly warns that this is not a space for escapism or absolutism, rather it is a place where Biophilic women are themselves the moving centre as opposed to the “dead” centre, the Archimedean point, “the

¹⁴⁴ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 23.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁴⁶ Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1962), pages 136, 148, quoted in Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 146.

¹⁴⁷ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 24.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 34–40.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 40 ff.

fulcrum from which...it may be possible to move the world.”¹⁵¹ This moving centre is the source of energy for women’s individualization and Participation in Be-ing, for abandoning the false self and patriarchal society.

Biophilic women, in light of such myths as The Fall and other misogynist religious teachings, have to challenge the false naming of themselves and men and God and evil.¹⁵² They need to withdraw their consent from patriarchal oppression and begin to reintegrate their divided selves. They need to realize that this will be a long process and that sadistic patriarchal males will try to undermine them at every turn.¹⁵³ In order to triumph Biophilic women need to be “intolerably deviant.”¹⁵⁴ Seeing Biophilically liberated women as the patriarchally hated antichrist, is an example of such intolerable deviance.¹⁵⁵ They also must withdraw their service as mirrors to the grandiose patriarchal self. This enables Biophilic women to find themselves and forces patriarchal men to face themselves and other people as they are. Daly believes such an exposure to reality for men will end wars because men will see that “the enemy” is within themselves.¹⁵⁶

Between the publication of *Beyond God the Father* and *Gyn/Ecology* Daly continues to develop her description of Biophilic women. They ask non-questions about non-data. They replace mirroring the patriarchal male’s grandiose self with “ludic cerebration,” a “thinking out of experience” that is open to the intricacies and ambivalences of the human situation.¹⁵⁷ This ludic cerebration is: “the free play of intuition in our own space, giving rise to thinking that is rigorous,

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 157.

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 47.

¹⁵³ Ibid., pp. 50-51.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 65. See also Daly, “Watergate: Religious Issues and Answers.”

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 95-97.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 197-198. Here Daly gives an excellent Horneyan analyses for the resolution of pathology. See Ch. 3.

¹⁵⁷ See Daly, “Post-Christian Theology: Some Connections Between Idolatry Methodolatry, Between Deicide and Methodicide,” p. 37.

informed, multidimensional, independent, creative, tough.” This kind of thinking is needed for Participation in Be-ing, so that Biophilic women can be “intuiting, reasoning, loving, imagining, making, acting, as well as couraging, hoping, and playing that are always there when one is really living.”¹⁵⁸ Daly also claims that these women are responsible for their own emancipation from the “planetary disease” of sexism and that they should not sacrifice themselves for other women.¹⁵⁹

Daly’s central demand of the Biophilic women of *Gyn/Ecology* is consciousness: they are to be very aware of patriarchy and all its ploys. They are to avoid the trap of sacrificing themselves for men’s salvation.¹⁶⁰ They must decode patriarchal language and myths that entrap and mutilate them.¹⁶¹ They must see patriarchal men as they are, lacking in biophilic energy and fearful of it, and indifferent to the destruction their lack and fear causes.¹⁶² Biophilic women must recognize the projection mechanism through which patriarchal men imbue them with terror in order both to control and destroy them.¹⁶³ Rape must be named as the paradigmatic boundary violation.¹⁶⁴ Biophilic women must realize that Christianity has bequeathed to its secular replacements the sadomasochistic belief that women enjoy suffering.¹⁶⁵ Daly’s constant theme is that Biophilic women name, analyze, and explain the patriarchal state with its patriarchal games.

¹⁵⁸ Mary Daly, “Autobiographical Preface,” In *The Church and the Second Sex*, 2nd. ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1975), p. 49.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39. See also “The Qualitative Leap Beyond Patriarchal Religion,” *Quest: A Feminine Quarterly* 1 (1975), p. 28; “A Short Essay on Hearing and the Qualitative Leap of Radical Feminism,” *Horizons* 2 (1975), pp. 120-124; and “The Courage to Leave: A Response to John Cobb’s Theology,” in *John Cobb’s Theology in Process*, eds. David R. Griffin and Thomas J.J. Altizer (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), pp. 84-98.

¹⁶⁰ Daly, *Pure Lust*, pp. 177-178.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41 ff.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, passim.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 19-20.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 69 ff.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 93 ff.

making both the state and the games visible, audible, and tangible. “By this righteous objectifying of those whose intent is to objectify us we come to *know* the limits of their reality.”¹⁶⁶

Daly also writes of Biophilic women as spooking, sparking, and spinning. Through spooking, Biophilic women fend off sadistic patriarchal attacks so that they can continue on their journey to psychological wholeness.¹⁶⁷ Sparking encompasses all those psychological dynamics that bind Biophilic women together in Sisterhood.¹⁶⁸ Spinning involves the creation of Biophilic selves and a biophilic cosmos.¹⁶⁹

The Biophilic woman as lucidly conscious is Daly’s continued focus in *Pure Lust*. In this text she picks up many of the points made previously, and weaves them into what remains her latest summary of the Biophilic woman’s psychological make-up. Biophilic women are women who Realize their power and who realize that their power fills men with dread and makes patriarchal women fearful.¹⁷⁰ Biophilic women also realize that they have to be their “own source of Self-esteem, having high expectations of [their] Sel[ves]...”¹⁷¹ living apart from the dissociated sadosociety so that they can reintegrate their formerly dissociated selves.¹⁷²

Biophilic feminist Selves have to reverse the patriarchal reversals and forsake horizontal violence against other women because it blocks women’s creativity. They need to realize that their primary task is to find their Selves and their Final Causality, which is “the centralizing force/focus within the Self and within all be-ing.”¹⁷³ They need to realize that separatism is

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 408.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 321 ff.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 354 ff.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 385 ff.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 188 ff.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 216.

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 370 ff.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 154.

necessary for the exorcism of misogynist patriarchal introjections. The “presence of absence” which is the normal state in patriarchy has to be replaced by a “presentient presence” that is animated with hope. The “presence of absence” is exorcised through Naming “actions, ideas, images, feelings...in Gyn/Ecological context.” Daly adds, “We do this in Archmagical Rites that include clear reasoning rooted in deep intuition and verified by direct experience.”¹⁷⁴ Reasoning evaporates misogynist patriarchal mystifications and Self-development exorcises patriarchal “presence of absence.”

Biophilic women want “happiness attainable by virtue of our *own* nature, not as a ‘supernatural’ dole, or handout.”¹⁷⁵ Biophilic women are agents of their own healing, and they unequivocally reject patriarchal otherness, connecting, rather, with their deep Original Selves to access the Self-esteem required for biophilic health.¹⁷⁶ The interlocking of all patriarchal assumptions has to be seen, understood, and transcended. Biophilic women “must re-Name with all of [their] Courage and creative power - with the process of [their lives] - the good that has been stolen from [them] through being stigmatized as evil.”¹⁷⁷ They must be “cannily cautious” to ensure that they do not become separated again from their Original Selves. They must reunite in themselves intellect and passion, and they must have compassion for all other women, including token and other patriarchal women.¹⁷⁸

Biophilic women’s radically unpredictable behaviour moves them outside the control of the Stag-nation. They Name the sexual caste system that is strangling the planet as well as its

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 149. This is Daly’s definition of “ludic cerebration.”

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 168.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 238.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 273.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 272-274.

patriarchal cause: the male arrogation of divinity expressed in their creation of an all-male god. This Naming will evoke the reign of Nemesis, and sadistic patriarchy will self-destruct by its own hand.¹⁷⁹

Biophilic women understand that they have nothing to lose in rejecting patriarchy, because patriarchy gives women nothing of value. They confront the voice of the introjected self-hater, “facing down the embedded self-hater, self-punisher, who keeps each victim dulled and unable to know the evidence of her own senses.”¹⁸⁰ They are conscious that they are a new species, consciously evolving and consciously aware of the possibilities for ever more evolution. They realize that the generalization, “human species” is a generic term without meaning in reality. They realize that the “gynocidal, genocidal, biocidal...”¹⁸¹ stagnated patriarchal male is a species totally different from Biophilic wild women who are forever changing.

Biophilic women refuse to be distracted from the biophilic journey of her Original Self with other Original Selves. They realize that this is the best strategy in the ongoing battle to prevent a relapse into phallocracy. This includes a refusal to respond to the patriarchal backlash with one of her own. If Biophilic women act spontaneously and unpredictably, patriarchal men will be thrown into confusion and will attack each other instead, a mutual self-destruction they will have to deal with themselves.¹⁸²

Biophilic women must overcome their amnesia of their personal and collective past. The reign of the Goddess in the Metamemory about the past and hidden in the Virgin Mary is a source of happiness and belonging. Remembering the childhood freedom in the relationship with their

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 275 ff.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 329-330.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 352.

¹⁸² Ibid., pp. 333-335.

mothers prior to being patriarchally feminized, is another Metamemory that needs to be tapped. By refusing to be bound by misogynist heterosexual norms, Biophilic women will remove themselves from the patriarchal memory of women as evil. Biophilic women also need to recover from aphasia and apraxia, the inability to speak in their own voice and to act out of their Original Selves.¹⁸³

Daly outlines four criteria that women can use to evaluate the genuineness of their psychological transformation from patriarchal pathology to biophilic health. First, they must have a sense of being categorically different from the patriarchal norm. They must be conscious that, as radical feminists, there will be a price to pay for this categorical difference. Secondly, they must be women-identified-women. Thirdly, they must remain radical feminists, even after all the less radical feminists who believe in a compromise with patriarchy, have left. Finally, radical feminists will have to see through the patriarchal god; not assume that the work of transforming from patriarchal women into Biophilic women will ever be finished as it is not easy to exorcise from one's head, the patriarchal god with all his sadistic psychological baggage. They will also have to forego thinking that it is easy to make oneself invulnerable to sliding back into the Sadostate.¹⁸⁴

It is essential, Daly believes, that each Biophilic woman discover her own separate species, her own inner code, by breaking and purifying herself of the embedded misogynist patriarchal codes, and finding meaning hidden under misogynist patriarchal meaning. "This is necessary for

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 354 ff.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 397-398.

breaking out of the pseudo-chrysalis in which the master mummifiers have encased/erased her.”¹⁸⁵

Biophilic women must become truly Odd women, no longer the patriarchal god’s women.

Before ending this chapter, I would like to address the issue of Daly’s understanding of how the reader is to interpret the descriptions within her categories. Early on in *Gyn/Ecology* she claims to be using the word ‘men’ in a generic manner, in the same way that the word is used in patriarchy. For Daly, to use a word generically is to falsify its meaning. This generic and false use includes patriarchal women as well. Daly insists that she is not talking about males, and by extension patriarchal women, *per se*:

In writing of ‘hollow men’ I am not referring specifically to males; rather I am using the pseudogeneric term, *men*, deliberately. For women are included in the invitation to hollowness, and insofar as they succumb they cease to be female-identified and become purely feminine: adorable and deplorable, but never really horrible, never Dreadful.¹⁸⁶

Early in *Pure Lust* Daly warns the reader that her use of the descriptor ‘snools,’ the mean-spirited rulers of sadosociety, is not an ontological use of the term, but a description of the persona of the patriarchal male: “Nags use words like *snool*, not to define the essence of any sentient being but to Name agents *as agents* of the atrocities of the sadostate...Snools could sometimes be called *persons* in the sense of the Latin word *persona*, meaning mask, actor, role. These *personae* ‘take over’ individuals who perform the snoolish functions required to maintain and perpetuate the sadostate.”¹⁸⁷ In case the reader thinks that she is dichotomizing the genders, Daly writes toward the end of the text that patriarchy is a disease that attacks the core of consciousness of both men and women, thus her analysis should not be seen as “a simplistic bifurcation on the basis of gender.”¹⁸⁸ In the final caveat of this text Daly returns to the concept of generic terms. She makes a comparison between the possibility of a humanistic perspective in patriarchy and the possibility of the presence of non-generic terms: “For there is no ‘humanistic’

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 409.

¹⁸⁶ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 50.

¹⁸⁷ Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 21.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 351.

perspective possible within patriarchy, any more than there is a truly 'generic' term."¹⁸⁹ The pseudo generic terms, like man and men, are male inventions that undergird the patriarchal cause. Again during a lecture at Dalhousie University in 1984 Daly reminds that the names she uses for patriarchal men, like snools, have no ontological referent.¹⁹⁰

In light of this examination of all her caveats, I am inclined to conclude that Daly is telling us that what she is describing when it comes to patriarchal men and women are their false selves and false consciousnesses. As there are no caveats regarding her description of Biophilic women, it seems safe to conclude that Daly believes that she is describing the real selves of non patriarchal women. Because there is no description of biophilically real men, and because Daly's description of Biophilically real women is so idealistic that it would include few if any women, I am moved to ask whether Daly is only describing false selves and false consciousnesses no matter how she labels them. As well, I wonder whether she is really to be believed when she claims that her description of the patriarchal male is not an ontological description? The first concern will be taken up in Chapter Four where I evaluate Daly's psychological descriptions in light of Karen Horney's theories; the latter concern will be taken up in Chapter Five where I review the secondary sources for support and critique of my analysis.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 383.

¹⁹⁰ Mary Daly, "Wanderlust Wonderlust - Remembering the Elemental Powers of Women," *Dalhousie Review*, 4 (1984), p. 671.

CHAPTER THREE: KAREN HORNEY'S LIFE, INFLUENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PARADIGM

3.1 Karen Horney's Life and Work¹

Karen Horney was born Karen Clementina Theodora Danielsen on September 15, 1885 in Eilbek, Germany. She was the second child and only daughter of Bernd Henrik Wackels Danielsen and Clothilde Marie Danielsen. She had one brother, Berndt, three and one half years older.² The marriage was unhappy perhaps partly due to the great difference in age, sixteen years, and some difference in class. Horney's father came from a seafaring family and her mother from a family of successful architects. There was also the negative impact caused by the four grown children from Wackel's previous marriage, who invariably supported their father over Horney's mother.³ Sonni, as her mother was called, counted on her children to shield her from Wackels, a sea captain, who to the happiness of the two children and their mother was frequently away.⁴ Horney seems to have benefited from the enlightened ideas of her maternal grandmother who believed that girls should have the same educational opportunities as boys. She also benefited from the mood of turn of the century Germany which was opening its institutions of higher learning ever so gradually to women. Thus Horney's ambition to be a doctor as a young adolescent was a real possibility when she was ready to attend.⁵ Along with this ambition was an inquiring and introspective mind, a mind with grave religious doubts by the time of her confirmation in the Lutheran Church when she was fifteen.

¹ The principal source for this information is Susan Quinn's biography, *A Mind of Her Own: The Life of Karen Horney* (New York: Addison-Wesley, 1988). This biography is built in part on the work of Horney's first biographer, Jack Rubins, who wrote *Karen Horney: Gentle Rebel of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Dial, 1978). The work that Quinn uses is the information from Rubins' interviews that he chose not to include in his account. Rubins' account is as idealizing of Horney as Janet Sayer's account in *Mothering Psychoanalysis* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1991) is demeaning. The latest biography of Horney's life and work is by Bernard J. Paris, *Karen Horney: A Psychoanalyst's Search for Self-Understanding* (New Haven: Yale, 1994). The biographer takes into account the other three, but his mission is to understand Horney's personal psychological struggles and how these struggles shaped her theory.

² Quinn, p. 19.

³ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

⁴ Ibid., p. 20.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 21-24, 40-44. For Horney's version of the events of her life from age 13 to 26 see *The Adolescent Diaries of Karen Horney* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).

All her life Horney tested ideas against her experience, and she never “gave up her longing for a faith transcending reason.”⁶ In 1904 Sonni separated from Wackels, an almost unheard of step at that time. Quinn notes that this would bring disgrace on the wife no matter how greatly the separation was merited.⁷

Horney began her medical studies in 1906 at Freiburg and finished them in Berlin, beginning her final year there in 1909. She married Oskar Horney in October of that year as well. She began seeing Karl Abraham, a psychoanalyst belonging to Freud’s inner circle, during the winter of 1910 for what would be a recurring struggle with depression. Her father died in 1910 and her mother, quite unexpectedly, in 1911, and both she and Oskar, in keeping with the mores of their class during this period, developed extra-marital relationships.⁸ In 1911 the first of her three daughters was born, and by 1912 she was part of Abraham’s psychoanalytic circle. Quinn notes that though Horney “was a very modern mother- receptive, nonjudgemental, and noninhibiting...Encouraging the girls to be active and independent, she was more deeply involved in her work than in parenting.”⁹ In 1925 Horney sent all three girls to Melanie Klein: Brigitte, fourteen, refused to go, Marianne, twelve, talked incessantly so Klein would have little time for interpretations, and nine year old Renate left versions of Klein’s interpretations in the neighbour’s mailboxes, an act that ended the girls’ Kleinian analysis.¹⁰

In 1923 Horney’s brother died unexpectedly, and Germany’s economic crisis fueled by enormous war reparation payments, high inflation, and the overprinting of money, saw Oskar Horney as one of its casualties as the Stinnes coal based conglomerate, of which he was an employee, collapsed.¹¹ A subsequent illness seems to have left Oskar somewhat brain damaged.

⁶ Ibid., p. 34. See p. 74: Quinn relates how a teacher’s refusal to have her in his males-only biology class in 1901 left Horney with a firm determination to dissect herself instead, a decision that foreshadowed her life’s work.

⁷ Ibid., p. 76.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 165-166.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 177-181.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 182-183.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 190.

His participation in unwise financial gambles threatened financial ruin for the family and lead to the final breakdown of the marriage in 1926.

Between 1922 and 1935 Horney wrote fourteen papers on the psychology of women, most of which were published in 1967 in the United States as *Feminine Psychology* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967). These papers dealt with female developmental psychology and psychological issues between the sexes, especially difficulties in marriage as well as the psychological etiology of sexism. Quinn believes that “Had [Horney] written nothing else these papers would have earned Horney a place of importance in the history of psychoanalysis.”¹² However, because these papers challenged Freud’s views on women’s psychology and how psychoanalysis might help marriage, and because she did not show the same deference for Freud that most others did, by 1930 she was seen as troublesome. Horney had been influenced in the 1920’s by the philosopher and sociologist George Simmel who took into account the cultural impact on behaviour, especially women’s behaviour and by George Groddeck, a fringe psychoanalyst, who pointed out what we now call the social construction of gender roles, and the importance of the mother as first love object of all babies, and the male envy of women’s capacity to give birth.¹³ Horney makes a telling comment about her understanding of the sexism that pervades the planet in a paper, “The Distrust Between the Sexes” she gave to the German Women’s Medical Association in 1930, that both reflects the influence of Simmel and Groddeck and perhaps even of 19th century German feminists. It also foreshadows what American women like Mary Daly would be saying forty years later.

At any given time the more powerful side will create an ideology...to help maintain its position and to make this position acceptable to the weaker one. In this ideology the differences of the weaker one will be interpreted as inferiority, and it will be proven that these differences are unchangeable, basic, or God’s will. It is the function of such an ideology to deny or conceal the existence of a struggle. [That is one reason] why we have so little awareness of the fact that there is a struggle between the sexes. It is in

¹² Ibid., p. 211.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 214-216.

the interests of men to obscure this fact; and the emphasis they place on their ideologies has caused women, also, to adopt these theories.¹⁴

Unlike Daly, Horney prefaces this comment with a statement of her unwillingness to blame all the ills in the world on male supremacy and her refusal to believe that female supremacy is the cure.¹⁵

It is interesting to note that Horney's cultural review of women's situation in this paper as the designated inferior in male ideology covers the Goddess, Eve, Mary, and the witchcraze.¹⁶

Another paper delivered in 1935 in the United States but not published until 1994 as an appendix in Bernard Paris' biography, and her last paper on women, warns women that they need to look out for themselves, especially in the economic sphere.¹⁷

In September of 1932 Horney left Berlin for Chicago where she worked with Franz Alexander until 1934. In 1934 she moved to New York City where she lived and worked until her death in 1952. She had difficulties working with Alexander who was six years younger than she and who had been one of her students in Berlin. Other pressures were adjusting to her new country and preparing for and writing the mandatory requalifying medical exams. Her interests in the impact of culture on behaviour led her to friendships with people like Margaret Mead, Paul and Hannah Tillich and Erich Fromm and to teaching assignments from 1934 until her death at the New School for Social Research. Her eclectic bent caused people like Sandor Rado to urge that she not be accepted into the New York Psychoanalytic Society even before she arrived in New York; a society that was becoming increasingly more Freudian as the European disciples of Freud

¹⁴ Karen Horney, "The Distrust Between the Sexes," in *Feminine Psychology* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967) p. 116, quoted in Quinn, p. 228.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 112-115.

¹⁷ Paris. pp. 232-238.

migrated to the United States in response to the rise of Adolph Hitler. The New School, as it was called, attracted the more liberal and eclectic immigrants like Horney, Tillich and Fromm.

Horney delivered a paper in 1936 to the New York Psychoanalytic Society that both challenged the universality of Freud's oedipal theory and insisted on the necessity of seeing this theory as culture-bound. She also challenged the emphasis on seeing the etiology of neurosis in the sexual conflicts of childhood. She said this was not much help in treating patients. Horney felt it was more productive to deal with the present than with the past.¹⁸ The publication of *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* in 1937 spelled out her differences with Freud to the delight of liberals and the consternation of orthodox Freudians. Her declaration that the Oedipus Complex was not universal even in western culture, and that it was a neurotic structure when it occurred due to inadequate parenting (not the frustration of biological drives) offended many of her peers as did her continued lack of deference to Freud. *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* published in 1939 deepened the anger of orthodox Freudians as she challenged many of Freud's key ideas and replaced them with theories of her own. According to Quinn, the main challenge presented in this text is Horney's insistence that the ego be the object of therapy. Whereas Anna Freud's ego psychology was rooted in the instincts, Horney's theory advocated the libido theory be abandoned as unsubstantiated. She believed that this was the only way the ego could become an object of therapeutic focus. For her, a more sensible etiology of neurosis was the disturbance in human relationships. Freud's death in 1939, concern with psychoanalysis' image in America, perhaps some envy of her popular success both with students and the American public along with fear of what such a popular psychoanalyst's negation of Freud might have on orthodox

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 293.

psychoanalysis, prompted New York Psychoanalytic Society members like Lawrence Kubie to work for Horney's removal from the society. This effort succeeded in 1941. Horney responded to being demoted from a training analyst to a lecturer by walking out of the meeting that made that decision. She handed in her resignation the next day, and almost immediately began setting up an institute of her own.

Within three weeks of resigning from the New York Psychoanalytic Society, Horney, with people like Clara Thompson, Eric Fromm and Harry Stack Sullivan set up the new institute - the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, shortly thereafter renamed the American Institute for Psychoanalysis. Not long after the first volume of this institute's journal was published - *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. By the fall of 1941 a curriculum to train psychoanalysts was in place. The New York Psychoanalytic Society did not sit back and let all this go on quietly. Quinn reports that Lawrence Kubie launched a "far-reaching campaign...to inform not only psychoanalytic colleagues but the wider world that the defection of Karen Horney was nobody's fault but her own."¹⁹ Had the American Psychoanalytic Association voted the American Association for Psychoanalysis' candidate into the presidency in the spring of 1941 all this might have been quite different. But Robert Silverberg lost by one vote to Karl Menninger and the forces of orthodox conservatism set to work to silence Horney by either ignoring or vehemently over-reacting to her later writings. Quinn reports that Horney's book, *Self-Analysis* published in 1941 "was either ignored or reviled by virtually every popular and psychoanalytic publication."²⁰ even though it was a carefully written book whose aim was to help people either during periods when they were not seeing an analyst or when seeing an analyst was not possible.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 356-357.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 356.

Unhappily, for Horney, the difficulties in Berlin, Chicago, and at the New York Psychoanalytic Society followed her into the new institute. The first split was in the spring of 1943 over whether Erich Fromm could be a training analyst since he was not a medical doctor. This question of “lay analysis” was not new to psychoanalysis. It had been raised while Horney was still in Europe. Freud, perhaps because his daughter Anna was not a medical doctor, vehemently opposed the exclusion of lay analysts. Horney believed it better for psychoanalysts to be medical doctors as well. But there was another problem. She and Fromm had been lovers. Their break-up had been bitter, perhaps in part because he had analysed her daughter Marianne who subsequently became more distant from her. Clara Thompson and Harry Stack Sullivan defected with Fromm. The winter of 1944 saw yet another split over whether the institute would affiliate with the Department of Psychiatry of the New York Medical College. Though initially in favour of this, Horney became more concerned as time went on that the institute would lose its autonomy and she refused to approve the plan. She lost six more members and was presented with a huge loss in leadership and training personnel. The day was saved, however, by a young and very ambitious candidate, Harold Kelman, who took over the day to day leadership of the institute for the next twenty-five years. In 1946 the institute began to prosper again. With things well, if rather dictatorially run by Kelman, Horney took longer holidays and worked more on her writing. In time, she fell out with Kelman, but he remained loyal to her.

Horney's final two books, *Our Inner Conflicts* published in 1945 and *Neurosis and Human Growth*, published in 1950, were distillations of her own theory. In her final text she states clearly that self-hate as alienation from one's self is the core problem in all neurotic illness:

“in all neurotic development the alienation from self is the nuclear problem.”²¹ She sees health in terms of wholeheartedness, authenticity and the recovery of the real self. Toward the end of her life, she explored Zen Buddhism to further her understanding of these issues. Her trip to Japan in the late summer of 1952, a few months before her death, culminated a life of self-reflection and reflection on human psychology. In 1952 the institute was thriving and the plan for a low cost psychoanalytic clinic, a long time dream of Horney’s, was announced in the spring of that year. It seems, from Quinn’s account, that Horney died as she lived, quite self-possessed, and quite self-aware.²² Karen Horney died on December 4th, 1952 at the age of sixty-seven.

3.2 Horney’s Influence

Karen Horney had a tremendous amount of influence in the psychoanalytic circles of which she was a part during her lifetime. Susan Quinn notes that Horney was a central figure in the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society. Students found her charming, down to earth, jargon free and insightful.²³ Quinn points out that a 1930 paper, “The Establishment of a Training Program: On Its Origins,” written in Berlin, remains with few modifications the standard paper in the area of training in the United States even today.²⁴ Quinn also believes that had Horney only written the papers on female psychology, the greater number of which were written while she was in Berlin,

²¹ Karen Horney. *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1950), p. 187.

²² Quinn, p. 415 ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 200. I found the following comment in a report of an interview with Horney that took place in 1946 in the Sterling Memorial Library (Yale): “The great advantage of Horney’s theory and method is the total absence of any one-sided rigidity. She offers unexpected opportunities to understand the most diverse type of neurotics and their problems...all this is accomplished without the use of forced and extreme jargon.” The interviewer’s identity is not known.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

these would be enough to “have earned Horney a place of importance in the history of psychoanalysis.”²⁵

In Chicago Horney was acknowledged as “a very fine supervisor” and “a marvellous clinician” who was able to keep politics out of the hours of supervision.²⁶ Quinn observes that the quality that made Horney so immensely popular in America was “her knack for describing the experience of others in a way that is instantly recognizable to them, in a way that makes them feel, ‘she is talking about me.’”²⁷ One of her students observed that “Horney had a sort of genius for touching people. Listeners might come away from a lecture by Franz Alexander, for instance, feeling they had encountered a brilliant European. They came away from Horney lectures feeling they had encountered themselves.”²⁸ Quinn notes that Horney’s strength from her first papers on women’s psychology was her “empiricism...she [went] back to her patients for understanding, then continually used her clinical and personal experience as a touchstone, employing the particular as a road to the universal.”²⁹

Horney’s first book, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* published in 1937 was reprinted thirteen times in its first ten years, and subsequent books were “equally popular.” After 1960 her books began to appear in paperback and by the late 1980’s had sold over a half a million copies.³⁰ Quinn argues that what Horney wrote about in all her books is now called ‘narcissism’, the “arrogance, self-centeredness, grandiosity, lack of sympathy or empathy, uncertain body image, poorly differentiated self and object boundaries, absence of enduring relationships, and a

²⁵ Ibid., p. 211.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 254.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 266.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 283.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 284.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 285.

lack of psychological substance, an inner emptiness...” that are usually associated with the myth of Narcissus.³¹ Though Quinn does not state it directly, perhaps because her principal interest is in Horney’s contribution to the understanding of women’s psychology, this observation supports the view of those who believe that claims that Horney’s theories are outdated are specious at best and malevolent at worst. Horney’s most recent biographer, Bernard Paris writes:

Horney is often perceived as having developed a culture-bound theory that describes only the neurotic personality of her time...but her theory evolved to encompass defences that are present in many societies, both Eastern and Western, from ancient times to the present day. Aggression, withdrawal, and compliance are complex human versions of the basic mechanisms of defence in the animal kingdom- fight, flight, and submission...The wide applicability of Horney’s theory has been shown by its use in literary criticism, biography, and cultural studies...”³²

Paris believes that Horney’s mature theory has been ignored thanks to the concerted efforts of orthodox Freudians to dismiss her as unworthy of attention; the clarity and lack of jargon in her writing and the common sense nature of her theory in an academic environment in which clarity and simplicity are believed to be fatal; and because Horney “tells us too many things about ourselves that we cannot reject but do not want to know.”³³ Paris also thinks that the present emphasis on searching for the origins of human motivation in the past rather than in the present as Horney does, leaves her structural explanations unsatisfying.

Horney’s death in 1952 was mourned around the world. Among the many tributes printed by the journal she helped found, the *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, is one reprinted from the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*. It gives some insight into why Horney is still well respected in some circles today, even as it fails to credit Horney with being faithful to her own

³¹ Ibid., p. 320.

³² Paris, p. xx.

³³ Ibid., p. xxi.

devotion to 'thorough-going procedures of investigation.' "Notwithstanding her defection from the American Psychoanalytic Association, there seems little doubt that Horney retained a strong devotion to Freud's procedure of thorough-going investigation of psychic conflict and did not sacrifice conscientious work with patients to rapid or superficial methods."³⁴ Her obituary in the *New York Times* acknowledged that "she was one of the leading psychoanalysts in the country."³⁵

Since her death, her influence has been felt in the institute she helped found and was dean of until her death, and in the journal she helped found. Her ideas are debated and built upon and sometimes even dismissed as irrelevant.³⁶ Outside the institute her work has a general impact in the social sciences, education and psychology.³⁷ There are forty-one American doctoral dissertations written between 1964 and 1991 that have Horney's psychological theory as a key focus. The topics include psychological healing, gender discourse analysis, the inter-relational factors involved in chronic migraines, gender relations in Faulkner's fiction, and Christian feminist spirituality.³⁸

³⁴ C.P. Oberndorf, M.D., "Obituary," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 34, 2 (1953), n.p., reprinted in *American Journal of Psychoanalysis* (hereafter *AJP*), 13 (1953), p. 13. See other tributes on pages 5-12.

³⁵ Obituary, "Karen Horney Funeral Will Be Held Today," *New York Times*, December 6, 1952, n.p.

³⁶ See for example: S. Rudolphson, "A Critique of Horney's Theory of Anxiety," *AJP*, 21 (1961), pp. 27-33; Louis De Rosis, "The Invented Self: Karen Horney's Theory Applied To Psychoanalysis in Groups," *AJP*, 34, 2 (1974), pp. 109-120, and the second part in 34, 3 (1974), pp. 199-212; Louis De Rosis, "Horney Theory and Narcissism," *AJP*, 41, 4 (1981), pp. 337-354; Jack Danielian, "Horney's Metapsychology and Western Culture," *AJP*, 34, 2 (1974), pp. 135-139; Douglas H. Ingram and Joyce A. Lerner, "Horney Theory: An Object Relations Theory," *AJP*, 52, 1 (1992), pp. 37-43; Jack Danielian, "Karen Horney and Heinz Kohut: Theory and the Repeat of History," *AJP*, 48, 1 (1988), pp. 6-24; Meryl Brown, "Application of Horney Theory in the Treatment of a Traumatized Child," *AJP*, 47, 1 (1987), pp. 3-20. My contact person at the Institute is the person who teaches the introductory course on Horney's theory. I was troubled to learn that she does not use this theory in her own practice, preferring that of the Lacanians!

³⁷ See Paul L. Wachtel, "Reconsideration: Karen Horney's Ironic Vision," *The New Republic*, January 6, 1979, pp. 25-28 for an interesting appreciation of Horney's theory from the late 1970's.

³⁸ See: Bethyl Joy Midura, "Psychodynamic, Existential, and Religious Views Pertaining to Psychological Healing: A Comparative Analysis" (Psy.D. diss. Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University, 1981); Elizabeth A. Barrett, "Femininity: Studies in the Social Psychology of Gender (Discourse Analysis)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Technology, Loughborough, U.K., 1990); Steven A. Hamon, "Social-Interactional Personality Factors in Chronic Migraine: Collateral Applications of Models Developed by Karen Horney and Timothy Leary" (Ph.D. diss., The

Horney's principal impact in the past thirty years has been in the area of women's psychology and women's issues. It is likely that she was catapulted back into the limelight by the publication of her essays on women's psychology, *Feminine Psychology*, in 1967. Nancy Chodorow acknowledges in the introduction to her text, *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*, that the first woman psychoanalyst to reflect on women's psychology is Karen Horney.

Psychoanalytic feminism has a rather complex and sometimes underground prehistory, a prehistory which recent work on early women psychoanalysts helps us to excavate. I locate its political and theoretical origins with Karen Horney, a second-generation analyst whose early essays on femininity forcefully challenge Freud. Horney asserts a model of women with positive primary feminine qualities and self-valuation, against Freud's model of women as defective and forever limited, and she ties her critique of both psychoanalytic theory and women's psychology to her recognition of a male-dominant society and culture. Horney's theories, and indeed the early psychoanalytic debates about femininity, do not seem to have made a major impact on mainstream psychoanalysis for many years, indeed, until the current revival of interest in female psychology sparked by the feminist movement and challenge. However, her theories form the basis, acknowledged or unacknowledged, for most of the recent revisions of psychoanalytic understandings of gender and for most psychoanalytic dissidence on the question of gender in the early period as well.³⁹

Chodorow also acknowledges here, as feminist psychiatrist Karen Johnson does below, that Horney's work was often used without crediting her. Johnson writes, "Horney was excluded from orthodox psychoanalytic circles. Insult was added to injury when many of Horney's ideas were incorporated into the works of others without giving her the credit that she was due."⁴⁰ Johnson believes that Horney has yet to receive the acknowledgement she deserves. Estelle

Fielding Institute, 1992.); Karen Rae Sass, "The Mother's Shadow: An Analysis of Gender Relations in Faulkner's Fiction" (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Binghamton, 1990.); and Patricia Ann Cooney, "Karen Horney's Psychological Theory and Its Implications for a Christian Feminist Spirituality" (Ph.d. diss., Catholic University of America, 1987).

³⁹ Nancy J. Chodorow, *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 3.

⁴⁰ Karen Johnson, *Trusting Ourselves: The Complete Guide to Emotional Well-Being for Women* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1991), p.16.

Roithin, in her 1992 article in *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary*, sees Horney as a person who has a “profound influence on psychoanalytic theories of FEMININITY, both within feminism and outside it...” and that she “propounded astonishingly advanced theories of male envy and fear of women, of the social determinants of penis envy and of a primary and active femininity.”⁴¹

3.3 Horney’s Psychological Paradigm

This section will be presented in five parts. The first three parts are background material to support the fourth and fifth parts, which are the presentation of the material that most directly parallels Daly’s psychological paradigm. The first part will be a general overview of how Horney’s theory developed. The second part will present further reflections on Horney’s conflict theory. Part three will deal with Horney’s theory of self-hate, part four will present Horney’s neurotic character typology, and part five will present Horney’s theory about how neuroses are resolved.

a) An Overview of the Development of Karen Horney’s Psychological Theory

Karen Horney describes the development of her theory of neurosis in the introduction to her text *Our Inner Conflicts: A Constructive Theory of Neurosis*, published in 1945, and in

⁴¹ Estelle Roith. “Karen Horney,” in *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary*, ed. Elizabeth Wright (Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1992), pp. 161-162. See: Marcia Wescott. *The Feminist Legacy of Karen Horney* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986). Wescott believes Horney was really writing about characteristically female psychology in the books she wrote between 1937 and 1950. I discussed this in a letter to Marianne Horney Eckhart: we both believe that Westcott is quite incorrect in her conclusion; Dee Garrison, “Karen Horney and Feminism,” *Signs*, 6, 4 (1981), pp. 672-691. Garrison believes that Horney engages in reverse sexism in her “malicious description of the development of masculinity.” (p.684) This evaluation and other comments on Horney’s biological determinism (p.689) and her lack of interest in social change (p.688) I find to be specious; Juliette Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (Markham: Penguin, 1974). Mitchell accuses Horney of essentialism regarding women’s nature (p. 128). For other views see: Agnes N. O’Connell, “Karen Horney: Theorist in Psychoanalysis and Feminine Psychology,” *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 1 ((1980), pp. 81-93; Robert Coles. “Karen Horney’s Flight From Orthodoxy,” in *Women & Analysis: Dialogue on Psychoanalytic Views of Femininity*, ed. Jean Strouse, (New York: Grossman, 1974), pp. 187-191; Rona Cherry and Lawrence Cherry, “ Karen Horney: The Psychiatrist Who Walked Out On Freud,” *Ms*, 3,12 (1975), pp. 112, 114-116, 120; and Marcia Ian. “Individuality and the Semiotics of Gender: Or, I Want to See a Woman’s Superbowl,” *Phoebe*, 2, 1 (1990), pp. 23-27.

Chapter 15 of *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization*, published in 1950.

In what is a striking example of what now would be called feminist methodology, Horney asserts that her theory “has grown out of my experience in analytic work with my patients and with myself.”⁴² She is hopeful that other psychoanalysts who are interested in her work will not only make her ideas known to their patients but that they will also apply them to themselves. She asserts that, “Progress in psychoanalysis can only be made the hard way, by including ourselves and our difficulties. If we remain static and averse to change, our theories are bound to become barren and dogmatic.”⁴³

Horney begins by seeing every neurosis as a character neurosis, necessitating a better knowledge of character structure. She acknowledges that others who have broken with Freud have also grappled with “the precise nature and dynamics of this character structure.”⁴⁴ Whereas they use a genetic approach, she looks to cultural influences, an approach she developed in the course of responding to Freud’s theory of feminine psychology.⁴⁵ In *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, published in 1937, Horney presents neurosis as “brought about by cultural factors- which more specifically meant that neuroses are generated by disturbances in human relations.”⁴⁶

When Horney asks herself what the driving forces are behind neurosis, she concludes that these forces are compulsive drives. They are not instinctual in nature as Freud claims, but specifically neurotic, “born of feelings of isolation, helplessness, fear and hostility, and [they] represent ways of coping with the world despite these feelings; they aim primarily not at satisfaction but at safety; their impulsive character is due to the anxiety lurking behind them.”⁴⁷ At this point in her thinking, there are two compulsive drives: one is a craving for power, the other is a craving for affection.

⁴² Karen Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts: A Constructive Theory of Neurosis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1945), p. 7.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴⁵ See Horney, *Feminine Psychology*. The essays contained in this volume were written between 1923 and 1937.

⁴⁶ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

In *Self-Analysis*, published in 1942, Horney renames the compulsive drives neurotic trends. The neurotic character structure is still of central significance. "I regarded it at the time as a kind of macrocosm formed by many microcosms interacting upon one another. In the nucleus of each microcosm was a neurotic trend."⁴⁸ The ten neurotic trends that Horney proposes⁴⁹ are later seen as accurately described but too isolated from each other: "I could see that a neurotic need for affection, compulsive modesty, and the need for a 'partner' belonged together. What I failed to see was that together they represented a basic attitude toward others and the self, and a particular philosophy of life."⁵⁰ Thus, the compulsive drive for affection becomes the neurotic movement toward people; the compulsive drive for power becomes the neurotic movement against people.

The role of conflicts in neurosis is Horney's next focus. In *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* neurosis is described as the result of a "collision of divergent neurotic trends."⁵¹ In *Self-Analysis* "neurotic trends not only reinforced each other but also created conflicts."⁵² Nonetheless, in these two texts, conflicts are side issues. As Horney develops her theory, she concludes that conflicts "operated between contradictory sets of neurotic trends, and though they originally concerned contradictory attitudes toward others, in time they encompassed contradictory attitudes toward the self, contradictory qualities and contradictory sets of values."⁵³ In what Horney describes as a "crescendo of insight"⁵⁴ she comes to see that her patients are not aware of their own contradictions and that when she points them out she is consistently met with aversion and elusiveness. When panic is the reaction to the recognition of conflict, the reason for the evasiveness becomes clear: patients dread the possibility that the power of their conflicts could "tear them to pieces."⁵⁵ Further, she notices the tremendous energy and intelligence that is

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

⁴⁹ See Karen Horney, *Self-Analysis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1942), pp. 51-56.

⁵⁰ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 14.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 15.

⁵² Ibid., p. 15.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 15.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 15.

generated in trying to “‘solve’ the conflicts, or more precisely, to deny their existence and create an artificial harmony.”⁵⁶

In *Our Inner Conflicts* Horney delineates four major attempts to solve neurotic conflicts. The first attempt is to “eclipse part of the conflict and raise its opposite to predominance.”⁵⁷ The second is neurotic detachment, an attempt to put neurotic conflict out of action. The third solution, which is central to her final work, is self-alienation. In this solution, the neurotic’s “whole actual self became somewhat unreal to him [sic]⁵⁸ and he created in its place an idealized image of himself in which the conflicting parts were so transfigured that they no longer appeared as conflicts but as various parts of a rich personality.”⁵⁹ Horney sees the idealized image as being “most important by reason of its far-reaching effect on the whole personality.”⁶⁰ She also believes that it generates the fourth solution: externalization. In this solution, the inner processes are experienced as happening outside the self. “If the idealized image means taking a step away from the actual self, externalization represents a still more radical divorce. It again creates new conflicts, or rather greatly augments the original conflict- that between the self and the outside world.”⁶¹ Horney holds that all four solutions are used in all neuroses in varying degrees and they cause “incisive changes in personality.”⁶²

Horney moves on, detecting the consequences of these conflicts: many fears, wasted energy, impaired moral integrity, and a deep despair over being so inextricably entangled. As well, she observes that this hopelessness generates, in some, sadistic trends, “an attempt at restitution through vicarious living, entered upon by a person who despaired of ever being himself.”⁶³

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 16.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 16.

⁵⁸ Horney follows the ‘generic’ conventions of her day. I will use ‘he’ throughout this chapter as I present Horney’s typology to be faithful to her work and so that the presentation will be consistent with quoted material. Nonetheless, the reader is reminded that Horney’s typology is gender inclusive.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 17.

⁶² Ibid., p. 17.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 18.

Horney concludes, in light of what she understands up to this point, that there are three psychological movements: toward, against, and away from people. In the neurotic, these movements are compulsive. In the healthy, they are not. The neurotic chooses to use one of these movements more than the other two in an effort to keep the self together. The idealized image created in support of this effort creates an artificial equilibrium that in itself creates new conflicts requiring new solutions.

In *Neurosis and Human Growth*, Horney's main focus becomes the idealized image, also called the idealized self, and hereafter called the idealized self. Its full significance as a neurotic solution in itself only occurred to her after she had written *Our Inner Conflicts*. In this last text she sees the idealized self as "a gateway to the whole area of intrapsychic processes."⁶⁴ This idealized self is a monster usurping the energies intended for self-realization. It creates in the neurotic a lack of interest in outgrowing the neurosis, and it replaces the drive for self-realization with the drive to actualize the idealized self. She explains:

Under inner stress...a person may become alienated from his real self. He will then shift the major part of his energies to the task of molding himself, by a rigid system of inner dictates, into a being of absolute perfection. For nothing short of godlike perfection can fulfill his idealized image of himself and satisfy his pride in the exalted attributes which (so he feels) he has, could have, should have.⁶⁵

With this new focus, Horney writes of a search for glory through success, power and triumph. She also continues to stress the importance of the intrapsychic conflict: the tyrannical inner system that tries to mold the self into a godlike being through neurotic claims and neurotic pride. She now sees that neurotics "hated and despised themselves with the same intensity and irrationality as they idealized themselves."⁶⁶ In due time she comes to realize that these are two aspects of the same process, and that this process is amenable to therapy.

⁶⁴ Karen Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1950), p. 149.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 368.

The final area of inquiry is the actual or real self.⁶⁷ The inner neurotic psychic process is seen as a growing alienation from the real self that begins with self-idealization. Self-hate is directed at the real self. From this emerges the realization that there are two kinds of neurotic conflicts. The conflict previously called the basic or original conflict between the self and the outside world is now called the conflict within the protective structure or pride system, hereafter simply called the protective pride system.⁶⁸ This conflict is described in terms of the three basic movements toward, against, and away from others. The second kind of neurotic conflict is labelled the central inner conflict and is the conflict between the protective pride system and the real self, between actualization of the idealized self and realization of the real self. The various pseudosolutions to the intrapsychic conflicts lend a tentative basis for suggesting different types of neurotic personalities.⁶⁹

Horney discerns a significant relationship between the search for unlimited perfection and power, and self-hate.⁷⁰ She comes to understand that they are inseparable. She points to the imagery of the 'pact with the devil' used in literature, to illustrate the neurotic's dilemma. The structure of the pact involves a human being in some psychic or spiritual distress, and a tempter who promises a miraculous riddance of the distress and the gift of infinite power in exchange for the distressed person's soul. She writes, "Certainly the parallel with the neurotic process...is striking: an individual in psychic distress arrogates to himself infinite powers, losing his soul and suffering the torments of hell in his self-hate."⁷¹ As well, neurosis can be seen as a problem of the

⁶⁷ Horney now makes a distinction between the actual and the real self, terms she used interchangeably in *Our Inner Conflicts*. The actual self is the empirical everyday self that is the object of mixed hatred within the protective structure or pride system. The real self is the hidden essence that is the object of pure hatred in the conflict between the pride system and the real self.

⁶⁸ Protective structure is the nomenclature from *Our Inner Conflicts*, and pride system that from *Neurosis and Human Growth*. The terms are synonymous.

⁶⁹ In *Our Inner Conflicts* the three types are Aggressive, Compliant, and Detached. These types are renamed in *Neurosis and Human Growth* as Expansive, Self-Effacing and Resigned. In this thesis I will use the descriptors Aggressive-Vindictive, Compliant-Morbidly Dependent, and Detached-Resigned, in an effort to mark both the synthesis of Horney's theory and the degree to which it reflects Daly's categories.

⁷⁰ Self-hate is another term about which Horney equivocates. She uses it both as a synonym for self-contempt and as the decision, however unconscious, to refuse to be one's real self. It is this latter use that is key for this thesis.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

self in a war with itself over what will be realized: the idealized self or the real self. This warfare is usually allayed with continually spiralling self-defeating strategies. Nonetheless, there remains the possibility that either therapy or the course of life itself will activate the constructive forces of the real self so that it might achieve self-realization.

b) Further Reflections on Horney's Theory of Psychological Conflicts

Before outlining Horney's typology I will look more closely at her theory of psychological conflicts. In Horney's work, neurotic conflicts are among the chief indicators of the presence of neurotic character typology.

Horney believes that conflicts are largely determined by the culture in which one lives. She observes that most people are unaware of the conflicts that afflict them, and are thus unable to resolve them. People allow themselves to drift and to be easily swayed. They often do not know where they stand and make compromises of which they are unaware. This results in their becoming entangled in contradictions without knowing it. If cherished values from the environment are adopted as a matter of course, conflicts that should arise do not.

Even if we recognize a conflict as such, we must be willing and able to renounce one of the two contradictory issues. But the capacity for clear and conscious renunciation is rare, because our feelings and beliefs are muddled, and perhaps in the last analysis most people are not secure and happy enough to renounce anything.⁷²

As well, decision-making implies responsibility and a willingness to take the consequences without blaming others, "and presupposes more inner strength and independence than most people apparently have nowadays."⁷³ The difficulty for the neurotic to recognize and resolve conflicts is increased a hundredfold. In general, awareness of feelings and desires is very limited.

⁷² Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 26.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Often the only conscious feelings are “reactions of fear and anger to blows dealt to vulnerable spots.”⁷⁴

Three factors involved in neurotic conflicts are: the absolute incompatibility of inner strivings; the unconsciousness of the conflict; and the tendency to be pulled compulsively in opposite directions at the same time. The differences between non-neurotic and neurotic conflicts are: the lesser disparity between the conflicting issues in the normal person; the existence of a feasible choice for the non-neurotic made “within the frame of a fairly integrated personality;”⁷⁵ and the fact that even if the non-neurotic is unaware of the conflict, that awareness can be aroused easily.

Horney believes that the basic conflict is rooted in the neurotic’s contradictory attitude toward others and, later toward the self.

The starting point...was anxiety, meaning by this the feeling a child has of being isolated and helpless in a potentially hostile world. A wide range of adverse factors in the environment can produce this insecurity in the child: direct or indirect domination, indifference, erratic behavior, lack of respect for the child’s individual needs, lack of real guidance, disparaging attitudes, too much admiration or the absence of it, lack of reliable warmth, having to take sides in parental disagreements, too much or too little responsibility, overprotection, isolation from other children, injustice, discrimination, unkept promises, hostile atmosphere, and so on and so on.⁷⁶

She adds that the child has a sense of “lurking hypocrisy,”⁷⁷ that the parents’ virtues are only a pretense. The child copes with this in an unconscious manner by shaping tactics to deal with the menacing forces in the environment. At the same time, these strategies evolve into neurotic character trends that become a lasting part of the child, as the child begins to move toward, against, or away from others, and consequently becomes more alienated from the real self as well. In doing so, one of the elements of basic anxiety is overemphasized, while the other two become

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 31.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 41.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 41.

secondary influences. In neurotically moving toward others, the emphasis is on helplessness, in moving against others- hostility, and in moving away from others- isolation. The predominant strategy adhered to is the one most comfortable to the conscious mind. Whether conscious or not, all strategies have an equally powerful influence, as seen in contradictory behaviour. The influence of any of the strategies depends on the gravity of the child's early environment: the more severe the menacing environment the more rigidly the neurotic trend is adhered to, and the more difficult it is for healthy influences to effect a positive change. For the non-neurotic the three trends with their corresponding attitudes are mutually inclusive. In the neurotic they are incompatible, as the neurotic lacks flexibility and the trends operate like a tumour in the entire personality.

In *Neurosis and Human Growth* Horney expands much of what is described above. As well, because she perceives that there is a second basic conflict, she looks more closely at the real self. She sees the real self as having unique and alive qualities like "the clarity and depth of his own feelings, thoughts, wishes, interests; the ability to tap his own resources, the strength of his will power; the special capacities or gifts he may have; the faculty to express himself, and to relate himself to others with his spontaneous feelings."⁷⁸ Because of the need to develop neurotic strategies to survive childhood, the child's personality develops particular needs, sensitivities, inhibitions, and moral values; and because neurotic adjustment is a never ending search for integration, the child becomes more and more divided over time. The opportunity to develop real self-confidence is absent because of the energy drain of the neurotic tendencies. This creates a desperate need for a substitute, something to counteract the feeling of being insubstantial. As well, as the neurosis escalates, alienation from the real self escalates and the potentially alive qualities become increasingly remote as the neurotic seeks safety above all. "His feelings and wishes thus cease to be determining factors; he is no longer, so to speak, the driver, but is driven."⁷⁹ This situation leads to confusion about personal identity, and further alienation from the

⁷⁸ Horney. *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 17.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

real self and others, requiring, “-it would be absurd to say a ‘substitute’ for his real self, because there is no such thing- something that will give him a hold, a feeling of identity. This could make him meaningful to himself and, despite all the weakness in his structure, give him a feeling of power and significance.”⁸⁰ This substitute is the idealized self. It is the centrepiece of the first basic conflict and it is pitted against the real self in the second basic conflict. The first basic conflict, that within the protective pride system, is not easily isolated in pure form because it is deeply imbedded in the psyche, because it is very disruptive by nature, and because of the massive defensive system that such a disruption generates. It is observable, however, indirectly through detecting the various attempts at its resolution.

Almost from the very beginning of her work, Horney perceived three fundamental neurotic solutions to the basic conflicts: moving toward, against, and away from others. She translates these movements into a neurotic character typology. In *Our Inner Conflicts* she wrote that she used the terms for simplicity not for typology. However, in *Neurosis and Human Growth*, she acknowledges that a character typology gives clarity, order and guidance, though it could never do justice to reality, and although it has definite benefits and limits.

In the framework of my psychological theories the neurotic character structure is central. And so my criteria for ‘types’ cannot be this or that symptomatic picture, or this or that individual trend. It can only be the peculiarities of a whole neurotic structure. These in turn are largely determined by the major solutions a person has found for his inner conflicts.

While this criterion is more comprehensive than many others used in typologies, its usefulness is nevertheless limited- because of the many reservations and qualifications we must make. To begin with, although people tending toward the same main solution have characteristic similarities they may differ widely with regard to level of human qualities, gifts, or achievements involved. Moreover, what we regard as ‘types’ are actually cross sections of personalities in which the neurotic process has led to rather extreme developments with pronounced characteristics. But there is always the indeterminate range of intermediate structures deriding any precise classification. These complexities are further advanced by that fact that, owing to the process of psychic fragmentation, even in extreme instances there is often more than one main solution.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

‘Most cases are mixed cases,’ says William James, ‘and we should not treat our classifications with too great respect.’ Perhaps it would be more nearly correct to speak of directions of development than of types.⁸¹

In *Our Inner Conflicts* Horney labels moving toward as “compliant”, moving against as “aggressive”, and moving away as “detached”. In *Neurosis and Human Growth* these become respectively, “self-effacing”, “expansive”, and “resigned”. In order to facilitate the goal of emphasizing the similarities in Horney’s and Daly’s description of pathology I will use the descriptors aggressive-vindictive, since vindictive is used in both accounts and is a key characteristic of this type; compliant-morbidly dependent, as morbidly dependent is used in both accounts as the worst compliant scenario; and detached-resigned, as Horney uses detached exclusively in *Our Inner Conflicts*, and resigned exclusively in *Neurosis and Human Growth*, with the latter being built on and extending the former. If one recalls Daly’s description of patriarchal men and women, respectively as basically sadistic or masochistic, the title-matching of Horney’s first two types is rather striking. As I will try to demonstrate, Daly’s Biophilic women of the Background have many of the same characteristics of Horney’s detached-resigned neurotic.

There is a further point to be made before beginning to describe the neurotic solutions in detail. Horney makes an adjustment in her solutions theory in *Neurosis and Human Growth*. The idealized self seen as a further attempt at neurotic solution in *Our Inner Conflicts* becomes the underlying neurotic solution in the last text, in its guise as the idealized self in search of glory. This inner dictator is seen by Horney as a “comprehensive neurotic solution - i.e., a solution not only for a particular conflict but one that implicitly promises to satisfy all the inner needs that have arisen in an individual at a given time.”⁸² Because Horney comes to see this seemingly fourth

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 191. See William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longmans and Green, 1902), p. 148.

⁸² Ibid., p. 23. One of the most frustrating things in trying to synthesize Horney’s theory is her failure to give notice of her own renaming from the second last to the last text. Initially I thought I was dealing with new categories in the last text, but closer scrutiny revealed that this was not so. For the most part there are only minor alterations, a change in emphasis, a rearrangement of the order of the elements of neurosis. In the end, I found the same underlying structure of neurosis that is so clearly presented in *Our Inner Conflicts*. It is more like rearranging the furniture in a room than a renovation.

solution as the underlying solution of each aspect of her tripartite typology, I will present it first when presenting her typology.

c) Self-Hate

Another area of Horney's theory that needs to be considered before going into a description of her typology of neurotic character pathology is her theory of self-hate. At the heart of this thesis is the proposal that seeing self-hate, as Karen Horney understands it, as the root of patriarchal pathology is a much more helpful approach to facing and working with that pathology than is seeing misogyny as the root of patriarchal pathology. As I will argue, to see misogyny as the root of patriarchal pathology requires a great deal of psychological distortion that only worsens the pathology, and fails to offer a way out of it.

Self-hate is the result of choosing the idealized self over the real self. Horney writes,

The glorified self becomes not only a phantom to be pursued; it also becomes a measuring rod with which to measure his actual being. And this actual being is such an embarrassing sight when viewed from the perspective of god-like perfection that he cannot but despise it. Moreover, what is dynamically more important, the human being which he actually is keeps interfering-significantly-with his flight to glory, and therefore he is bound to hate it, to hate himself.⁸³

Horney sees the actual or real self as the "omnipresent stranger" constantly tripping up the idealized self: "The actual, empirical self becomes the offensive stranger to whom the idealized self happens to be tied, and the latter turns against this stranger with hate and contempt. The actual self becomes the victim of the proud idealized self."⁸⁴

Self-hate is the visible proof of the split in the personality that the creation of the idealized self initiates. It signals the state of war in every neurosis, both within the protective pride system and between that system and the real self. The latter struggle, also called the central inner conflict, has the greater power to tear the neurotic apart because of the total involvement of both

⁸³ Ibid., p. 110.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 112.

forces, and because the real self is fighting for its survival. To hate the real self is to hate one's ontological being. Self-hate is both powerful and tenacious, but ultimately impotent because the idealized self counts on the real self for its own existence and for its search for glory. Horney believes that this reality prevents many suicides.

Self-hate is not only a result of the idealized self, it also helps to maintain that image. To face self-hate is to face the question of who one is, if one is not the idealized self. As well, self-hate, which is both cruel and merciless, alienates the neurotic from himself, and its being challenged requires that he develop some sympathetic feelings for the real suffering self.

Awareness of self-hate varies from momentary flashes to total lack of awareness. Its effectiveness relies on its unconsciousness. However, the neurotic is aware of its effects: feeling guilty, inferior, cramped and tormented. There is also self-minimizing, an incapacity to enjoy things, directly self-destructive actions and masochistic trends.

Horney believes self-hate operates in six modes: relentless demands on self, merciless self-accusation, self-contempt, self-frustration, self-torment, and self-destruction. In the first mode, she points out that "the shoulds," the inner dictates that ensure both the actualization of the idealized self and the eradication of the real self,⁸⁵ are determined as much by self-hate as by neurotic pride, and that failure to fulfill them unleashes self-hate. In the second mode, the constant self-accusations that further weaken the neurotic's ability to live up to his idealized self even if he could, make it increasingly more difficult to appease neurotic pride and the shoulds. As well, there is a tragic irony that he rails at himself for what is beyond his control and is timid about dealing with what is in his control. Going on the defensive, counterattacking, appeasing, ingratiating, fighting blindly, trying to wriggle out, blaming someone else, and pleading guilty are the unconstructive self-protective measures against this mode.

Self-contempt is expressed in self-belittling, disparaging, doubting, discrediting, and ridiculing and is directed against any effort at real self improvement. Consequences of this mode

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 64-85.

are that the neurotic is caught in endless destructive self-comparison, in hypersensitivity to criticism, in taking abuse from others and in compulsive pursuit of the affection, and attention that would counterbalance this self-contempt. Horney maintains that the neurotic clings to his idealized self because the only other option is self-hate. Self-frustration is a result of the compulsive nature of the neurotic's wishes making them forever unachievable. This also applies to his claims. Horney points out that the neurotic does not intend to frustrate himself, rather this is a result of the shoulds. Self-torture is a function of the neurotic's trying to whip himself into shape and of all the above mentioned modes. The intensity of the neurotic's self-torture relates directly to the intensity of his sadistic trends. Horney explains:

Self-hate finally culminates in pure and direct self-destructive impulses and actions. These may be acute or chronic, openly violent or insidious and slow grinding, conscious or unconscious, carried out in action or performed in imagination only. They may concern minor or major issues. They aim ultimately at physical, psychic, and spiritual self-destruction. When one considers all these possibilities, suicide ceases to be an isolated enigma. There are many ways in which we can kill something that is essential to our life; actual physical suicide is simply the most extreme and the final expression of self-destructiveness.⁸⁶

Although neurotic self-destructiveness is compulsive, Horney asserts that the neurotic, nonetheless, secretly co-operates in his moral deterioration. Horney sees the search for glory, supported by the shoulds, neurotic pride and claims, and externalization, as an active moving away from the real self. The moves against the real self include many of the facets of self-hate. The neurotic would like to make his real self disappear. The consequences are felt in his emotional life, his energies, his faculty to direct his own life, his capacity to assume responsibility, and his capacity for integration.

Horney concludes: "Surveying self-hate and its ravaging force, we cannot help see in it a great tragedy, perhaps the greatest tragedy of the human mind. Humankind in reaching out for the Infinite and Absolute also starts destroying himself. When he makes a pact with the devil,

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 148.

who promises him glory, he has to go to hell - to the hell within himself.”⁸⁷ And herein, I will argue, lies the tragedy of patriarchy, a many faceted neurosis, whose root, like that of all neuroses, is self-hate, a self-hate that destroys both the patriarchal male and the patriarchal female and everything with which they come into contact.

d) The Search for Glory

The search for glory is tied up intimately with the idealized image of the self. The search for glory includes the need for perfection, neurotic ambition and vindictive triumph. As will be seen in the presentation of the aggressive-vindictive type, vindictive triumph is the most destructive element in the search for glory. Other characteristics are the neurotic's compulsiveness and imaginativeness. As the need for glory is insatiable, its frustration brings terror of doom, disgrace, panic, depression, despair, and raging at self and others. All these reactions are very out of proportion to the precipitating event.

Horney believes the neurotic in search of glory is “the antithesis of the truly religious man. For the latter, only to God are all things possible; the neurotic's version is: nothing is impossible to *me*. His will power should have magic proportions, his reasoning be infallible, his foresight flawless, his knowledge all encompassing.”⁸⁸

e) Horney's Psychological Typology

i) The Real Self

Horney writes of the self as actual, real, idealized, and despised. The real and the actual self I write about under the rubric of the real self as that is the term she uses as early as 1939 in her text *New Ways In Psychoanalysis*. The real self is the healthy self. The idealized and the despised self are false selves, and are viewed by Horney as expressions of neurosis.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 154.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 35.

The real self is spontaneous, and individual,⁸⁹ “the most alive center of psychic life.”⁹⁰ Horney believes that a child raised in a reasonably supportive environment is likely to develop to his full potential. “He will develop then the unique alive forces of his real self...that central inner force, common to all human beings and yet unique to each, which is the deep source of growth.”⁹¹ Bernard Paris points out that this self is the “possible self,” something that is “not a fixed entity but a set of ‘intrinsic potentialities’ - including temperament, talents, capacities, and predispositions - that are part of our genetic makeup...”⁹² For Horney, actualizing the “alive, unique, personal center” is the purpose of life.⁹³ The real self houses the “healthy conscience” [which is] “the reaction of our true self to the proper functioning or the malfunctioning of our total personality.”⁹⁴ In sum,

[The real self] provides the ‘palpitating inward life’; it engenders the spontaneity of feelings, whether these be joy, yearning, love, anger, fear, despair. It is also the source of spontaneous interests and energies...; it is the part of ourselves that wants to expand and grow and to fulfill itself...our real self, when strong and active, enable us to make decisions and assume responsibility for them. It therefore leads to genuine integration and a source of sense of wholeness, oneness.⁹⁵

ii) The Idealized Self⁹⁶

⁸⁹ Horney, *New Ways In Psychoanalysis*, pp. 91-92.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹¹ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 17.

⁹² Paris, *Karen Horney*, p. 183.

⁹³ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 185.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 131-132.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁹⁶ The distinction Horney makes between the idealized image used in *Our Inner Conflicts* and the idealized self, used in *Neurosis and Human Growth* is that in the former it is the ideal that is striven for; in the latter the ideal is realized. This distinction is made in the final text (in which she makes the further distinction that the neurotic solution is idealized- whether it be goodness, love, strength, heroism, leadership, aloofness, wisdom- before the neurotic becomes the idealized image/idealized self. See *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 22.) But a careful reading of *Our Inner Conflicts* reveals that the term idealized image contains both these meanings. This is true of almost, if not all, of the term changes from the second last to the last book. Unfortunately this lack of technical precision adds an element of confusion to her work and exposes her theory to negative reviews. See J.A.C. Brown, *Freud and the Post-Freudians* (New York: Penguin, 1961), p. 148, and Susan Quinn, p. 388 ff. I do not think Quinn or Brown did a very careful reading of the final text. Unlike Quinn, I find *Neurosis and Human Growth* neither moralizing, repetitious, or of less value than *Our Inner Conflicts*.

The idealized self is that substitute for the real self that the neurotic slowly develops over time, and that is central to each of the neurotic solutions. At first it is merely an ideal for which to strive; in time it becomes the identity of the neurotic. The idealized self, like an historical novel, takes its basic material from the real potential of the neurotic. Like the novel, the image then develops into something fantastic, a product of a well-developed imagination. The degree of arrogance is proportionate to the degree of the idealization's lack of facticity. The degree of affirmation needed is also equally proportionate. Horney observes that "We do not need confirmation for qualities of which we are certain, but will be extremely touchy when false claims are questioned."⁹⁷ Horney points out that the idealized self is most blatant in psychotics, whereas it is less fantastic in neurotics but no less real. "If we regard the degree of removal from reality as marking the difference between psychoses and neuroses, we may consider the idealized image as a bit of psychosis woven into the texture of the neurosis."⁹⁸

The idealized self is an unconscious component of neurosis of which the neurotic may have only a vague sense in terms of asking too much of her or himself. Nonetheless, this idealization is experienced as a genuine striving for ideals of which the neurotic is proud. If the neurotic identifies with the idealization, a godlike perception of self emerges. If the focus is on a more realistic self, then that self is despicable by comparison to the idealization. This 'more realistic self' is, Horney writes, as imaginary as the idealized self. She calls this self in *Our Inner Conflicts* the despised image, and in *Neurosis and Human Growth* the despised self, and hereafter called the despised self. The discrepancy between both imaginary images/selves is monitored by the shoulds:

If finally, the focus is upon the discrepancy between the idealized image and the actual self, then all he is aware of and all we can observe are his incessant attempts to bridge the gap and whip himself into perfection. In this event he keeps reiterating the word 'should' with amazing frequency. He keeps telling us what he should have felt, thought, done. He is at bottom as convinced of his inherent perfection as the naively 'narcissistic'

⁹⁷ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 97.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

person, and betrays it by the belief that he actually could be perfect if only he were more strict with himself, more controlled, more alert, more circumspect.”⁹⁹

The difference between neurotic ideals and authentic ideals is that the former are worshipped and static. They retard growth. The latter are dynamic and motivate a person toward their approximation. Horney believes that “Genuine ideals make for humility, the idealized image for arrogance.”¹⁰⁰

Horney sees the idealized self functioning as a substitute for real self-confidence and pride. The neurotic’s childhood likely allowed few possibilities to develop these assets, and whatever may have been developed is eroded over time by the escalation of the neurosis. This idealization and all its attendant auxiliary strategies¹⁰¹ drain the energy away from aliveness, making self-determination impossible; indeed, the development of self impossible. The more the real self is repressed the greater the inflation of the idealized self, and the more the destructive the supporting defences such as constant comparison with others and the desire to triumph over them.

The neurotic does not feel weak in a vacuum but in a world peopled with enemies ready to cheat, humiliate, enslave and defeat him. He must therefore constantly measure and compare himself with others, not for reasons of vanity or caprice but by bitter necessity. And since at bottom he feels weak and contemptible...he must search for something that will make him feel better, more worthy than others. Whether it takes the form of feeling more saintly or more ruthless, more loving or more cynical, he must in his own mind feel superior in some way- regardless of any particular drive to excel. For the most part such a need contains elements of wanting to triumph over others, because no matter what the structure of the neurosis there is always vulnerability and a readiness to feel looked down upon and humiliated. The need for vindictive triumph as an antidote to feeling humiliated...is one of the driving forces in the neurotic need for superiority...¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 98.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 99.

¹⁰¹ See *Our Inner Conflicts*, chapters 7-12, and *Neurosis and Human Growth*, chapters 1-6 for a detailed explanation of these auxiliary strategies. In the former text they are: externalization, the blind spot, rationalization, excessive self-control, arbitrary rightness, elusiveness, cynicism, fears, impoverishment of personality, and hopelessness; in the latter they are: the search for glory, neurotic claims, the tyranny of the shoulds, neurotic pride, and self-hate.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 101.

Horney theorizes that the competitiveness of American culture, with the concomitant disturbances in relationships, promotes neurosis in general and identification with idealized self in particular.

Because the idealized self is a substitute for self-confidence and pride, its ideals have no obligating power. On the other hand, faults and shortcomings are covered up and account for the idealization's rigidity. The shortcomings that become conscious reveal the basic conflict: the compliant-morbidly dependent abhors hostility and aggressiveness; the aggressive-vindictive abhors fear and helplessness; and the detached-resigned abhors coercion and commitment. The rigidity of the idealization is necessitated by the need to keep the inner conflicts unconscious, and the surface harmony intact. The more intense the conflicts, the more rigid the idealization. The more firmly the idealization is established, the more neurotic it is, and the more the real self is effaced. Horney reminds her readers that initially the idealization is lifesaving, even though in adulthood its claims become a tremendous hindrance. "As long as his image remains real to him and is intact, he can feel significant, superior, and harmonious, in spite of the illusory nature of those feelings. He can consider himself entitled to raise all kinds of demands and claims on the basis of his assumed superiority."¹⁰³ Horney observes that in therapy the neurotic's fear of both seeing himself as a contemptible being and being "torn to pieces", initially outweighs the merits of "becoming a much better human being, worth more than all the glory of his idealized image..."¹⁰⁴

Because the idealized self is fictitious, it is very vulnerable to external criticism and internal insight. The neurotic's life becomes restricted to lessen exposure of the image to the danger of hostile reality. The more the idealization is seen as a masterpiece the less the neurotic feels is required by way of growth and development. Horney explains that, "Since nothing can actually be achieved without work, he defeats by his attitude the very ends he is driven to attain. And the gap between his idealized image and his real self widens."¹⁰⁵ The endless approval and

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 109.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 109.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 110.

flattery required reassures only temporarily and can lead to an unconscious hatred of those who provide it. And the more desperately the image is clung to, the more violent the hatred. If arrogance is repressed, as it is in the compliant-morbidly dependent, and the detached-resigned types, the neurotic may admire himself blindly in the arrogance of another only to discover that the other does not care for him. As well, being oblivious to the feelings, desires and beliefs of the real self creates an “unconscious pretense and rationalization, which makes for precarious living.”¹⁰⁶ Finally, interest in life is drained away and a growing sense of unreality ensues.

One of the most debilitating results is the escalated raging against the real self with the resultant wavering between the idealized self and the despised self. The conflict generated “between compulsive, contradictory strivings on the one hand and a kind of internal dictatorship...”¹⁰⁷ signals the basic conflict within the protective pride system. Responses to this conflict might be narcissistic, perfectionistic, or cynically rebellious.¹⁰⁸

All these consequences are barriers to growth. Neurotics are unable to learn from their mistakes because they cannot see them and they are bound to lose interest in their own development. All thoughts of growth are directed to perfecting the idealized self. The compliant-morbidly dependent type may strive to become the epitome of Christlike virtues; the aggressive-vindictive type may strive to become the epitome of political leadership; and the detached-resigned neurotic may endeavour to become the epitome of philosophical wisdom. Horney sees this shift from the real self to the idealized self as “no less than a change in the course of the individual’s whole life and development.”¹⁰⁹ She concludes:

The task of therapy, therefore, is to make the patient aware of his idealized image in all its detail, to assist him in gradually understanding all its functions and subjective values, and to show him the suffering that it inevitably entails. He will then start to wonder whether

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 111.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 112.

¹⁰⁸ These possible responses to the interpsychic conflict between the idealized and despised images/selves will later be seen as part of the aggressive-vindictive solution.

¹⁰⁹ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p.24.

the price is not too high. But he can relinquish the image only when the needs that have created it are considerably diminished.¹¹⁰

iii) The Compliant-Morbidly Dependent Neurotic Solution¹¹¹

This type of neurotic has an insatiable need for affection, approval, and safety; for being wanted, loved, welcomed and needed; and for a constantly available partner who will meet all expectations and take full responsibility. The intrinsic worth of others and their feelings are not a concern for this type.

Characteristic of all neuroses, this type's needs are compulsive and indiscriminate and they generate anxiety and despondence when they are frustrated. The central need of this individual is for a belonging that fulfills the total orientation toward safety. However, this neurotic overrates his congeniality, generosity, goodness, humility, sympathy, sensitivity to the needs and expectations of others, appreciativeness, gratefulness, self-sacrificing of personal demands, and whatever he believes may be held in common with others, and is thus unable to discriminate others' separateness from his own, or others' feelings, desires, and beliefs from his own. Having given to the others all that is believed the others expected, this neurotic is greatly disturbed when others do not return the favour.

This neurotic subordinates his self to others, allowing others the spotlight, even when it should have been his own. He takes for granted that others are more worthwhile than himself and that self-worth rises and falls according to the perceived evaluation of other people. Being rejected by others terrifies this person. Horney observes that the compliant-morbidly dependent type "may make the most abject effort to win back the regard of the person who has thus threatened him."¹¹² This individual avoids quarrels and competitions, and is appeasing and conciliatory, bearing no conscious grudge. In the presence of aggressive-vindictive neurotics, his sense of worth plummets even further. He willingly bears the blame and is apologetic and self-

¹¹⁰ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 114.

¹¹¹ As noted elsewhere, what will be presented here and in the sections that follow, is a synthesis of Horney's theory taken from *Our Inner Conflicts* and *Neurosis and Human Growth*.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 54. Horney points out that this is not masochism *per se*: the neurotic is simply acting in accordance with his or her internal logic.

scrutinizing no matter the circumstances. All aggressive behaviour is prohibited and the wish for vengeance and vindictive triumph is deeply buried. Horney notes that “egotism, ambition, callousness, unscrupulousness, wielding of power are abhorred - though these attributes may at the same time be secretly admired because they represent strength.”¹¹³ The prohibition of aggressive behaviour inhibits, in turn, this individual’s capacity for self-assertion, ability to be critical, leadership, and healthy ambitious strivings. Finally, this person is unable to be alone, seeing this as rejection. His need for others is often frantic, even when feelings of self-hate are in moderate control. So, for this neurotic, finding the right person by whom to be loved is seen to be the answer to all his problems, and the search is an essential aspect of the solution. However, the compulsiveness of this need incapacitates judgement and he often chooses as a partner the aggressive-vindictive neurotic whose arrogance and vindictiveness is experienced vicariously. This unconscious symbiosis explains both the neurotic’s failure to see the partner as abusive and the unwillingness to separate from such partners. As I will argue in Chapter Four, this unconscious colluding symbiosis is what is at the heart of Daly’s description of the pathology of patriarchy.

The neurotic characteristics of this type are idealized by their owner. The helplessness and suffering that are the real results of neurotic dependency, as well as the belief in his great generosity to others whether the others want what is given or not - he is totally unconscious of the strings attached to such giving - are the basis for the neurotic claim that everything demanded is both necessary and deserved. This neurotic’s positive qualities are absolutized and the negative counterparts, also absolutized, are repressed out of awareness. Horney concludes: “Giving prominence to one trend by submerging all discrepant elements is an unconscious attempt to organize the personality. It constitutes one of the major attempts to solve neurotic conflicts.”¹¹⁴

In writing about this type’s childhood Horney believes that he grows up in the shadow of a greatly admired parent or sibling, or of a very demanding ill parent. Whatever the case, the

¹¹³ Ibid., pp. 54-55.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 57.

neurotic's own aliveness is squelched, and an unconscious strategy to please and lean on others is pursued.¹¹⁵ Whatever hostility is experienced is repressed, and is thus continually and unconsciously generated because the chosen strategy continues to invite abuse. This in turn increases the individual's vulnerability and feeling of being neglected, rejected, and humiliated, which in its turn becomes a claim for others to make up for past injuries.

Like all neurotics, this type puts a premium on repression. Horney observes, "When I say that all these feelings, drives, attitudes are 'repressed' I use the term in Freud's sense, meaning that the individual is not only unaware of them but has so implacable an interest in never becoming aware of them that he keeps anxious watch lest any traces be disclosed to himself or others."¹¹⁶ Every repression raises for Horney the question of the interest the neurotic has in such repression. For the compliant-morbidly dependent type she believes the answer lies in the idealized self and in the sadistic trends.

The idealized self is composed, Horney notes, of " 'lovable' qualities, such as unselfishness, goodness, generosity, humility, saintliness, nobility, sympathy. Helplessness, suffering, and martyrdom are also secondarily glorified."¹¹⁷ A premium is placed on feelings for people, nature and culture. Horney believes that this neurotic is caught in a bind. To live up to the idealized self the person has to disavow all aggressiveness and pride- even in the 'loveable' qualities. This disavowed pride is nonetheless evident in the patient's vulnerability and in the view of himself as a victim.

Two weaknesses of this solution are the shrinking of whatever real and alive potential the neurotic has for self-realization, and his becoming helpless prey to self-hate as a result of the suppression of anything perceived to be aggressive. Because this neurotic does not see the connection between the suppression of aggression and increased self-hatred, he is proud of the self-reproachments that this suppression generates; the self-reproachments are seen as a badge of

¹¹⁵ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, pp. 221-222.

¹¹⁶ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 56.

¹¹⁷ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 222.

personal honesty. As well, this neurotic fails to see that his or her easy acceptance of the abuse of others is a passive externalization of his own feeling of self-abuse and self-hatred, which, Horney believes, is “an almost constant undercurrent in his whole attitude toward life.”¹¹⁸ This self-hatred that is at the heart of all neuroses is not as effectively warded off by this neurotic as it is by those exhibiting the other two trends. Whereas the aggressive-vindictive type hates and despises others and the detached-resigned type keeps aloof from any involvement with others, the compliant-morbidly dependent neurotic craves connections with others. His idealized self demands that he be understanding and forgiving; therefore any hostile feelings towards others must be repressed. Horney notes that the patient “accepts the verdict of his inner tyranny - which in turn increases his already reduced feelings about himself.”¹¹⁹ This passive externalization is also seen “in his feeling accused by others, suspected or neglected, kept down, treated with contempt, abused, exploited, or treated with outright cruelty.”¹²⁰ Yet the neurotic only experiences the intensity of his self-hatred when the defence of self-minimizing is malfunctioning. The inner tyranny is placated in the same way as the outer tyranny- by admitting to a very exaggerated guilt. This strategy is meant to gain sympathy for suffering, reassurance for helplessness, and mercy for guilt, as well as taking the sting out of the self-accusations.

The strategy of this neurotic for seeing himself as the victim even when he is the wrong-doer is another defence against self-hatred. The more vicious the self-hatred, the more frantic is the need to be seen as a victim. Only a willingness to give up the claims of the idealized self, with the concomitant acceptance of his share in the difficulties, will bring any alleviation to the escalating suffering with its escalating claim for love. The flip side of this is actually allowing himself to be the victim of an aggressive-vindictive partner. This allows this neurotic to hide his aggressive feelings in suffering and it gives his feelings a legitimate basis as well. Horney sees the importance in this type’s feeling abused as “the greatest stumbling block to the patient’s

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 230.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 225.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 225.

experiencing the inner conflict for which self-effacement was a solution.”¹²¹ However, feeling abused increases hostility toward others and this needs to be increasingly suppressed to keep the idealized self and all the claims for love that result from it, intact.

As indicated above, only when this person’s defences fail him does the vindictive resentment spill out. However, it is quickly reabsorbed into rationalizations of being upset, or more characteristically in increased psychosomatic suffering or depression- the indirect way of getting even with others and making them feel guilty. Horney observes that “His suffering accuses others and excuses himself.”¹²² As well, this neurotic uses his suffering to excuse a lack of achievement: he would have done better, but... And seeing one’s suffering as noble and glorious in an unfeeling world where one can forgive and perish as a hero in one’s own eyes, lends this suffering a compulsory quality. If the environment is unsupportive of all this pretence, emotional breakdown and suicide are possible outcomes. As with other neurotic elements, suffering is indispensable for keeping the idealized self intact, and can not be done away with unless there is a radical change in the neurotic’s whole character structure.

To examine the sadistic trends and this neurotic type, it is necessary to turn to Horney’s understanding of the morbidly dependent aspect of this type as lived out in a relationship with the aggressive-vindictive neurotic. This relationship, because of its duration, and the sadistic need of the aggressive-vindictive to cling to the victim, is seen by Horney to be the best illustration of the consequences of such a relationship for the compliant-morbidly dependent type.¹²³

The drive that traps the compliant-morbidly dependent neurotic into a sadomasochistic relationship is the aspect of the love goal that Horney describes as a longing for surrender and unity. She points out that longing for surrender is key in many religions, and that the longing for

¹²¹ Ibid., p. 232.

¹²² Ibid., p. 235.

¹²³ The aggressive-vindictive neurotic type will be described in detail in the next section. Between these two presentations, the sadistic trends, as Horney understands them, will be covered, and therefore will not be dealt with again in a later section that presents the ancillary props of the neurotic character structure.

unity is one of the strongest motivating forces within the human being, especially for the divided neurotic:

To love, for him, means to lose, to submerge himself in more or less ecstatic feelings, to merge with another being, to become one heart and one flesh, and in this merger to find a unity that he cannot find in himself. His longing for love thus is fed by deep and powerful sources: the longing for surrender and the longing for unity...And although the self-effacing surrender is a caricature of the healthy yearning, it nevertheless has the same power...Going still another step deeper: the appeal love has for him resides not only in his hopes for satisfaction, peace, and unity, but love also appears to him as the only way to actualize his idealized self.¹²⁴

The goal sought with the aggressive-vindictive partner is a relationship of absolute harmony, the responsibility for which is entirely the compliant-morbidly dependent's armed with the tyranny of her shoulds and the pathology of the idealized self. Efforts to create this harmony become the claim to the exclusive devotion of the partner who should be willing to fulfill every need. The compliant-morbidly dependent's shoulds and claims, which are diametrically opposed, keep him on a constant roller coaster. If this type has a non-neurotic or non aggressive-vindictive partner, the relationship may not be devastating for the neurotic who would be the tyrant-suppliant claiming absolute devotion because of the suffering and abuse he claims to have endured.

The compliant-morbidly dependent individual who suppresses his aggressive traits is compulsively spellbound by their externalization in the aggressive-vindictive person. Horney notes that this partnership often starts out with an insult to which the compliant-morbidly dependent initially responds with anger, then a desire for vengeance, followed by fascination, and finally with the compulsion to win the aggressor's love to keep intact the idealized self as the one who can conquer all others by love. To do so, he endures all kinds of abuse, so that it appears that he craves suffering. Rather, Horney believes, "He craves to surrender himself body and soul, but can do so only if his pride is bent and broken. In other words the initial offence is not so

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 240-241.

much intriguing because it hurts as because it opens the possibility for self-riddance and self-surrender.”¹²⁵ The aggressive-vindictive, on the other hand, fears love, Horney believes, because

his unconscious realization that he would have to relinquish much of his neurotic pride for the sake of love. To put it succinctly: neurotic pride is the enemy of love. Here the difference between the expansive [aggressive-vindictive] and the self-effacing [compliant-morbidly dependent] type is that the former does not need love in any vital way but, on the contrary, shuns it as a danger; while the latter love – surrender appears as a solution for everything, and hence a vital necessity. The expansive type, too, can surrender only if his pride is broken, but then he may become passionately enslaved, [so his]...fear of love is well founded – for him.¹²⁶

Horney describes this relationship in a heterosexual context with the compliant-morbidly dependent type as the female partner, and the aggressive-vindictive type as the male partner. Because this description parallels Daly’s sadomasochistic patriarchal axis, with the male at the sadistic extreme and the female at the masochistic extreme, I will follow Horney’s gender designation for this part of the description. Both Horney and Daly acknowledge that their descriptions are not innate biological gender descriptions, though as will be seen in Chapter Five, a majority of commentators on Daly’s work differ with her claim in this regard. Horney finds men and women in both types, though in American culture as it is constructed the female is more readily seen in the compliant-morbidly dependent role.¹²⁷ Daly, for her part, acknowledges that there is sadomasochism within the patriarchal male and a masosadism within the patriarchal female.

For the compliant-morbidly dependent person the relationship is totally absorbing- all her other relationships and responsibilities are neglected. Her every mood is contrapuntal to his. Her total focus is understanding and helping him. Her main fear is antagonizing and thus losing him.

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 246.

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 246.

¹²⁷ Horney wrote: “The fact that under the conditions of our civilization this obsession is more frequent and more apparent in women than in men has given rise to the notion that it is a specifically feminine longing. Actually, it has nothing to do with femininity or masculinity but is a neurotic phenomenon in that it is an irrational compulsive drive.” Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 59.

He in turn wants her total dependence, wants her to see everything through his eyes and his experience. She becomes rootless and increasingly impoverished in every way. Yet, they seem to fit together: he is the master, she is the slave; he demands, she complies.

The main tensions are created over her demand for love and affection- her claim for her surrender. He sees clearly that her love is self-seeking, that she wants to merge with him, and in his fear and disgust he strikes out abusively at her. She tries harder; he becomes more rejecting. Her clinging, her efforts to coerce him, to understand him, and her pretence at moral superiority, anger him and he wishes to destroy all this in her. Horney observes,

Whatever he demands is his self-evident due. There is no appreciation forthcoming but much nagging irritability when his wishes are not fulfilled. He feels and declares in no uncertain terms that he is not at all demanding but that she is stingy, sloppy, inconsiderate, unappreciative- and that he has to put up with all sorts of abuse. On the other hand he is astute at spotting her claims, which he finds altogether neurotic. Her need for affection, time or company is possessive, her wanting sex or good food, overindulgence. So when he frustrates her needs, which he must do for reasons of his own, it is in his mind no frustration at all. It is better to disregard her needs because she should be ashamed of having them. Actually his frustrating techniques are highly developed. They include dampening joy by sulkiness, making her feel unwelcome and unwanted, withdrawing physically or psychically. The most harmful, and, for her, least tangible part is his pervasive attitude of disregard and contempt. Whatever actual regard he may have for her faculties or qualities is seldom expressed. On the other hand, as I have already said, he does despise her for her softness and for her caginess and indirectness. But in addition, because of his need for active externalization of his self-hate, he is faultfinding and derogatory. If she in turn dares to criticize him, he discards what she says in a highhanded manner or proves that she is vindictive.¹²⁸

Her response to his behaviour is ambivalent. On the one hand because she is not a fighter, she wants to comply. As well she longs to surrender totally and can only do so when her pride is broken. Thus part of her welcomes his behaviour and secretly collaborates. This collaboration might be expressed in her allowing herself to be subjected to and to co-operating in degrading

¹²⁸ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 250. I have quoted this at length because it is such an excellent example of the points of contact between Horney's and Daly's psychological paradigms: the morbidly dependent and aggressive-vindictive duo and the patriarchal male and female pair.

sexual activity, which for her may be the only way to attain sexual satisfaction.¹²⁹ Or, Horney notes, it may be more disguised-

in many other ways, such as her eagerness- or rather urgency- to whitewash him and to take upon herself the blame for his misdemeanor, or in her abjectness in serving and deferring to him. She is not aware of it, because in her mind such deference registers as humility or love, or humility in loving, since as a rule the urge to prostrate herself- except in sexual matters- is most deeply suppressed.¹³⁰

Because she has idealized her partner the realization of his abusive behaviour is not experienced to be as important as the opportunity to surrender completely and love absolutely.

If she is to disentangle herself from this relationship she needs to develop a profound awareness that neither her goal of being loved, nor her goal - tied to her idealized self - of proving that her love can conquer everyone, can be met. Horney points out that this is a long, drawn-out process of seeing the truth and then forgetting it in another round of trying to achieve the neurotic goals. At some point she may begin to hate him and the longing to make him love her may become, Horney believes, a "matter of vindictive triumph."¹³¹ Ironically if he does fall in love with her, she loses interest because "she can't love with her pride satisfied."¹³² If she fails to win his love, both goals lose their value, and the reality of the abuse may become inescapably obvious. At first, she turns on herself for her vindictiveness and her failure to win his love. This is passively externalized as feeling abused by him. But her ambivalence drives her back to him for reassurance and invites him to be even more abusive. Horney concludes, "The partner then becomes the executor of her own self-destruction. She is driven to be tormented and humiliated because she hates and despises herself."¹³³ She is now at a crossroad. She can sink into the appeal of a final solution of being martyred for the cause of love, either in suicide or suicidal surrender to his

¹²⁹ Horney wrote: "This urge for total surrender by means of self-degradation seems to account more fully than other explanations for the masochistic perversions." *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 251. I think this can be taken as a response to Helen Deutsch's claim that women are masochistic.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 251-252.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 254.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

abuse, or she can swim against the current and endeavor to free herself. Even if she frees herself this time, she may fall into another morbidly dependent relationship, or she may resign herself to living in fear of what may happen to her if she is attached to someone again. Horney believes that, "provided she can mobilize sufficient constructive forces during her struggle and has matured enough through the real suffering involved, plain ordinary honesty with self and efforts to get on her own feet can go far toward attaining a measure of inner freedom."¹³⁴

iv) The Aggressive-Vindictive Neurotic Solution¹³⁵

A feeling of superiority, conscious or unconscious, determines all the aspects of this neurotic's life. The mastery of life is what appeals to the aggressive-vindictive type. Horney believes this feeling of superiority "chiefly entails his determination, conscious or unconscious, to overcome every obstacle- in or outside himself- and the belief that he should be able, and in fact is able, to do so...The reverse side of the necessity for mastery is his dread of anything connoting helplessness; this is the most poignant dread he has."¹³⁶ This neurotic is bent on self-glorification, ambitious pursuits, and vindictive triumph. Life is to be mastered through intellect and will to allow for the actualization of the idealized self.

Horney notes that both Freud and Adler refer to such a type, Freud in the need for narcissistic self-aggrandizement and Adler in the need to be on top, but she says that again they do not grasp the whole picture. The whole picture includes the repressed compliant-morbidly dependent trend. The subjective conviction of superiority of this type can only be maintained if it rigidly and compulsively keeps this latter trend from consciousness.¹³⁷

As with all neurotics, anything that contradicts the idealized self has to be imagined out of awareness. The imperfections are imagined or actively externalized as the imperfection of others. The aggressive-vindictive lives the pretence of being all knowing, loving, generous and wise. He

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 258.

¹³⁵ The source for this section is Chapter 8 of *Neurosis and Human Growth*.

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 192.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 192.

is consciously and, or unconsciously proud of deceiving others, and these others are held in contempt. This person is most afraid of being deceived by others, and is consequently very humiliated if this occurs. The other fear lurking in the aggressive-vindictive is that he is a fraud, no matter the degree of real intelligence, generosity, and hard work. As a result there is extreme sensitivity to criticism and the fear of failure which disallows the enjoyment of real successes.

Horney divides this type into three sub-types: narcissistic, perfectionistic, and arrogant-vindictive. In referring to Freud's use of narcissistic, she comments that he uses the term to include "rather indiscriminately every kind of self-inflation, anxious concern with one's own welfare and withdrawal from others."¹³⁸ Horney uses the term specifically in its original meaning of being in love with one's idealized self. In the case of the narcissistic sub-type, he adores his image which results in a buoyancy and self-confidence that most other neurotics lack. Horney observes that an "unquestioned belief in his greatness and uniqueness is the key to understanding him."¹³⁹ There is nothing this neurotic cannot do, and no one that he cannot win over. This individual gives the impression that he loves mankind, is tolerant, and can take jokes about his foibles. As long as his authority is not seriously challenged and he is surrounded by admiration and acclaim, a semblance of integration can be maintained. The narcissistic sub-type has an endless capacity to turn his flaws into virtues. His importance overrides the rights of others, and he expects others to love him unconditionally no matter how much they have been injured.

Obviously such a type will have difficulty in relating to others who do not see things the same way. In addition, because this neurotic overrates his ability, personal schemes often fail, and there can come a point when the pile up of failures and rejections is crushing. At this point, the narcissistic sub-type's repressed self-hate may attack with its full force, bringing depression, psychotic episodes and suicide. Yet, Horney notes, "As long as he is on the crest of a wave, he

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

cannot possibly admit that he has failed in anything, especially in mastering life. The discrepancy is not in him, but in life itself.”¹⁴⁰

The perfectionist sub-type identifies with his own standards. He is superior because of personal high moral and intellectual standards. His arrogant contempt of others is hidden behind a pretence of friendliness. His life is regulated by the tyranny of personal shoulds. Failure to measure up to these shoulds is dealt with in two ways. The first is parallel to striving for the idealized self and seeing oneself as it. The perfectionist equates his striving for moral and intellectual perfection as equivalent to already having attained it. He can therefore actively externalize personal failed standards and hold others in contempt for not living up to them. The second defence is seeing his perfection as a kind of bargaining chip for exemption from ordinary misfortunes. Since this neurotic is so perfect and superior these misfortunes should not happen to him. Horney speculates that when misfortune strikes it may bring the perfectionist “to the verge of collapse. He not only resents ill fortune as unfair but, over and beyond this, is shaken by it to the foundations of his psychic existence. It invalidates his whole accounting system and conjures up the ghastly prospect of helplessness.”¹⁴¹ Finally, any recognition of his own imperfection may send this neurotic into a tailspin of self-hate and subject him to the fears and helplessness of the repressed compliant-morbidly dependent unconscious trend.

The arrogant-vindictive sub-type identifies with his own pride. The need for vindictive triumph is this neurotic’s way of life. In other neurotics the need for vindictive triumph is held in check by love, fear, and desire for self-preservation. Horney postulates that,

Only if these checks are temporarily or permanently malfunctioning can the vindictiveness involve the total personality- thereby becoming a kind of integrating force, as in Medea- and sway it altogether in the direction of vengeance and triumph. And in the type to be discussed it is the combination of these two processes - powerful impulse and insufficient checks - that accounts for the magnitude of vindictiveness.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 196.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 197.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 198.

The arrogant-vindictive sub-type is extremely competitive. He cannot tolerate anyone who achieves more, wields more power or is in any way more superior. This neurotic compulsively denigrates a rival and works to defeat that rival. He is treacherous. Violent rages are the most obvious indication of the sub-type, and the impulse for vengeance is so strong that he may jeopardize his own life and that of others, as well as personal job security and social position. The aggressive-vindictive is convinced that at bottom everyone is malevolent. He sees friendliness as hypocrisy. He is openly arrogant and often rude and offensive. In subtle and gross ways this neurotic humiliates and exploits others. Horney observes that "He is a past master in frustrating others- frustrating their small and big hopes, their needs for attention, reassurance, time, company, enjoyment. When others remonstrate against such treatment, it is their neurotic sensitivity that makes them react this way."¹⁴³ If the arrogant-vindictive's shortcomings are pointed out to him, he justifies them as necessary in a 'dog eat dog' world. This neurotic is not openly demanding, but does expect that all his neurotic needs will be implicitly respected while he feels implicitly permitted to disregard the needs and wishes of others. The aggressive-vindictive can criticize others, but is not to be criticized. If his claims are not met, he responds with a punitive vindictiveness and intimidation expressed in irritability, sulkiness, making others feel guilty, and in open rages. Claims are justified on the basis of his superiority and the injury he has sustained. Horney notes that,

In order to solidify this basis for claims he must, as it were, treasure and keep alive injuries received, whether ancient or recent. He may compare himself to an elephant who never forgets. What he does not realize is his vital interest in not forgetting slights, since in his imagination they are the bill to present to the world. Both the need to justify his claims and his responses to their frustration work like vicious circles, supplying a constant fuel to his vindictiveness.¹⁴⁴

As well, Horney believes that this neurotic defends his vindictiveness, because it generates excitement and the feeling of being alive.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 201.

Horney believes that the source of such vindictiveness is in a childhood “with few, if any redeeming qualities. Sheer brutality, humiliations, derision, neglect, and flagrant hypocrisy, all these assailed a child of especially great sensitivity.”¹⁴⁵ The child gradually hardens, deciding that genuine affection is not attainable or does not exist, or is no longer desirable, or is to be scorned. Horney sees this as a step with very grave consequences “because the need for affection, for human warmth and closeness is a powerful incentive for developing qualities that make us likeable.”¹⁴⁶ The child’s feeling of not being loved, convinces him that he is not lovable, and because this sub-type refuses to care, free range is given to his vindictiveness. Its expression is only checked by prudence or expedience, not by any concern for self or others. Later in life this neurotic refuses the friendship of others who would get in the way of the realization of the dream of self-vindication that puts everyone else to shame. Horney notes that, “Driving himself from victory to victory, in large and small matters, he lives for the ‘day of reckoning’ ...Love, compassion, considerateness- all human ties- are felt as restraints on the path to a sinister glory...To admit any human need becomes a sign of despicable weakness.”¹⁴⁷

What motivates the intensity of this sub-type’s vindictiveness is the need to prove his self-worth. This is done by arrogating to the self whatever qualities are necessary for the goal of vindictive triumph. Because not needing others is so important, developing a godlike self-sufficiency is a priority. The aggressive-vindictive is both unable to ask or to receive. All feelings are choked off. He prides himself in outwitting others. Because life has been unmerciful to this neurotic from the beginning, being invincible and inviolable are indispensable. Should a hurt penetrate this individual’s armour, the pain and humiliation of allowing another to inflict such an injury can be intolerable and cause a crisis within the protective pride system.

The aggressive-vindictive is also motivated by fear: he is afraid of others, their retaliation, their interfering with his use of them. This fear is fended off by exaggerating the hostility of

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 202.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 202.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 203-204.

others. His self-hate emerges when the invisible façade begins to crumble. The compliant-morbidly dependent trends take over and the ensuing desire to be loved is deeply despised.

Horney writes,

The self-hate and self-contempt that now appear are appalling in their dimensions. Self-hate is always cruel and merciless. But its intensity or its effectiveness depends on two sets of factors. One is the degree to which the constructive forces counteract the self-hate- forces such as faith in positive values in life, the existence of constructive goals in life, the existence of some warm or appreciative feelings toward oneself. Since all these factors are unfavorable in the aggressive-vindictive type, his self hate has a more pernicious quality than is usually the case. Even outside the analytic situation one can observe the extent to which he is a ruthless slavedriver of himself, and frustrates himself- glorifying the frustration as asceticism.¹⁴⁸

In order to protect himself from breaking down, the aggressive-vindictive actively externalizes his self-hate and self-frustration, despising especially all manifestations of the compliant-morbidly dependent trend in others and frustrating their needs at every chance. If this neurotic's standards are not met, vindictive punishment follows. Yet, Horney cautions, 'His punitive attitude towards others, which looks altogether vindictive, is instead a mixed phenomenon. It is partly an expression of vindictiveness; it is also the externalization of his condemnatory punitive trends toward himself, and, finally, it serves as a means of intimidating others for the purpose of asserting his claims.'¹⁴⁹ The rigidity of this sub-type's self righteousness- the belief in the right to arrogate what is not his and have others not retaliate- is a function of the need to protect the idealized self. Any doubt of this right jeopardizes the whole character structure.

Horney concludes her presentation on this sub-type by calling attention to this type's right to the analyst's compassion. She believes that in the past this neurotic's arrogance, callousness, sadism, and egocentricity were too easily written off as irreparable. Rather, she believes that "when we realize how deeply he is caught within the machinery of his pride system, when we

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 207-208.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 208.

realize the efforts he must make not to be crushed by his self-hate, we see him as a harassed human being struggling for survival.”¹⁵⁰ The aggressive-vindictive can only be understood in the light of his pride and its vulnerability. The intensity of the vindictiveness must be seen in light of the effort to protect against self-hatred. Both of these, as in all neurotic trends, are compulsive. And the need of this neurotic for self-vindication is rooted in the original childhood tragedy. The need to be right with its arrogant claims are meant to keep self-doubt at bay. The compulsive faultfinding is an externalization of self-hate. The insensitivity to suffering is rooted in the need to be invulnerable. The attitude of having nothing to lose is rooted in the lost belief in his own lovableness or even in the existence of love. There is a bitter envy that arises from the feeling, rooted in the reality of his childhood experience, that he has been excluded from life. The aggressive-vindictive feels viciously and deliberately humiliated by the happiness of others and thus does what he can to obliterate it. Finally, Horney reminds therapists that the aggressive-vindictive does not choose his neurotic stance voluntarily, and thus is as worthy as any other patient of the best effort and care.

v) The Detached-Resigned Neurotic Solution¹⁵¹

In *Our Inner Conflicts* the detached-resigned type is seen to have a compulsive need for solitude. Horney observes that “Only if there is intolerable strain in associating with people and solitude becomes primarily a means of avoiding it is the wish to be alone an indication of neurotic detachment.”¹⁵² Though this neurotic emphasizes his estrangement from people, neurotic estrangement is typical of all neuroses. What differentiates the detached-resigned type is the degree of estrangement.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 209.

¹⁵¹ Chapter 5 of *Our Inner Conflicts* and Chapter 11 of *Neurosis and Human Growth* are the sources for this section. There is very little overlapping between these two presentations, the latter presentation being a more sophisticated continuation of the former.

¹⁵² Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 73.

Estrangement from self involves a numbness to emotional experience and an uncertainty about who one is, whom one loves and hates, what one desires, hopes for, fears, resents and believes. Again, this is typical of all neuroses, and again in this type it is a matter of degree. The detached-resigned lacks the comparatively rich emotional life of the other two trends. He acts and lives like someone who looks alive, but in keeping with the goal, nearly all life has come to a halt within. Horney notes that "What all detached persons have in common is something quite different. It is their capacity to look at themselves with a kind of objective interest, as one would look at a work of art."¹⁵³ This approach applies to life in general.

There is a crucial need and determination, conscious and unconscious, to put as much emotional distance as possible between oneself and others- to not get involved emotionally in any way. Horney says, "They draw around themselves a kind of magic circle that no one may penetrate."¹⁵⁴ The compulsiveness of this need is seen in the anxiety this neurotic experiences when anyone or anything threatens to intrude. Horney's concept of the impenetrable emotional magic circle will be a key concept in the effort to understand Daly's resolution of the sadomasochistic patriarchal pathology that she describes.

Like the aggressive-vindictive, this type's principal need is for self-sufficiency, but for very different reasons. The former needs self-sufficiency to defeat a hostile world. The latter needs self-sufficiency so he can live the isolation that this solution requires. Unfortunately this self-sufficiency requires the restriction of needs. Horney notes that "the underlying principle here is never to become so attached to anybody or anything that he or it becomes indispensable."¹⁵⁵ The detached-resigned would rather forgo socializing, friendship, competition, prestige, success, than jeopardize aloofness. Illness is resented because it leaves this neurotic at the mercy of others. He prefers to find things out for himself than trust others. He is shocked by personal questions that are seen as an invasion of privacy.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 75.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 75.

The detached-resigned's self-sufficiency and need for privacy serves the need for utter independence. Though this independence allows for a degree of integrity unavailable to the other trends, this neurotic's seeing it as an end in itself makes the need for self-sufficiency and privacy compulsive and indiscriminate and gives him a negative orientation, that Horney believes is "aimed at not being influenced, coerced, tied, obligated."¹⁵⁶ The degree of sensitivity regarding his independence is seen by Horney to be a good gauge for the extent of this individual's detachment-resignation.

The detached-resigned avoids long term commitments, and anything structured, or anything perceived to be coercive like marriage, timetables, rules, expectations and advice. The need to feel superior that is common to all neuroses, is here connected with this person's isolation and independence. Horney speculates that "probably nobody can stand isolation without either being particularly strong and resourceful or feeling uniquely significant."¹⁵⁷ When the detached-resigned's magic circle is shattered he reaches out frantically for love and protection.

As with all neurotics, this neurotic's imagination is a prime source of support. The need for superiority that supports the needed isolation is maintained, in part, by imaginary achievements. The feeling of uniqueness is a function of the initial move to guard what is authentically the detached-resigned's self from what was and is still perceived to be a most unwelcoming environment. Horney notes that this type would be content in hell, so long as he has a room of his own and does not have to mingle with the others. Horney adds,

He takes extraordinary pride in having kept free of the levelling influences of the environment and is determined to keep on doing so. In cherishing his unchangeableness he raises the rigidity inherent in all neuroses to a sacred principle. Willing and even eager to elaborate his own pattern, to give it purity and lucidity, he insists that nothing extrinsic be injected. In all its simplicity and inadequacy the Peer Gynt maxim stands: 'To thyself be enough.'¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

The detached-resigned has an intense interest in self observation, with the scientist's joy in discovering the intricate psychic patterns at work in himself. Yet, he is closed to suggestions that would lead to change, or to an altered sense of self and the world. Horney notes that "he is almost as unfailingly willing to observe as he is unconsciously determined to remain as he is."¹⁵⁹

The detached-resigned endeavours to suppress all feelings even to the extent of denying their existence. The idealized self is to be strong and peaceful, and is to avoid long conversations and requests for help. It withdraws to work on itself. It has given up dreams, and the only guiding morals are to be true to itself and to expect nothing. The worst aberration is to seek sympathy or to expect help. Experience has taught it that close association with others brings conflicts, and that its best work is achieved when its feelings are suppressed. Any dependency is treachery against this inner idol. Horney postulates that "it is as if every situation had to be carefully tested from the standpoint of a possible loss of freedom before feeling could be allowed full play. Any threat of dependence could cause him to withdraw emotionally."¹⁶⁰

Unlike the compliant-morbidly dependent and the aggressive-vindictive, this type has compartments of genuinely spontaneous emotional expression, and thus areas where real creativity can occur. This is rooted in the fact that his solution is the result of protecting the real self as opposed to despising or rejecting it. Two problems that these compartments of genuine spontaneity create for this type are that his need for help is not obvious and the limited creativity of which he is capable further masks any need for help. Furthermore, like the aggressive-vindictive, emphasis is placed on dealing with life through intelligence and reason. Horney comments that this neurotic's dilemma is his approximation to the idealized self of the culture.

In a relationship this type is, Horney writes, "unaware of how little he himself gives, and he believes he has bestowed his unexpressed and unlived feelings, so precious to himself, upon the partner."¹⁶¹ If he has to choose between love and independence, the latter wins very easily. This

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 86-87.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 84.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 85.

neurotic does well enough in situations with other detached-resigned persons, and in these circumstances can sustain a genuine loyalty. Sex, if indulged in, may be the only emotional bridge to others. Concerning relationships, he is more apt to substitute imaginary ones for real ones.

When the detached-resigned is challenged, the reaction can be very extreme. He contemplates ending the relationship. This individual can also become very abusive. Horney observes that if this neurotic is forced to be in a group he “may thrash about blindly to extricate [himself]. [He] can be more expert at finding methods of escape than a man whose life is attacked.”¹⁶² No price is too great to pay for the preservation of this independence.

As in other neuroses, that which is vigorously defended must have great value for its defender. Horney points out that the benefits that accrue from healthy detachment are available to the neurotically detached in proportion to the severity of the neurosis. These values are in the area of personal integrity. She believes that in a generally friendly and honest society this would not be notable. “But in a society in which there is much hypocrisy, crookedness, envy, cruelty, greed, the integrity of a none too strong person easily suffers; keeping at a distance helps to maintain it.”¹⁶³ Horney also notes that this neurotic can enjoy a degree of genuine peace of mind, original thinking and feeling, and creativity provided that life within his magic circle is not emotionally dead. On the other hand, should his protective pride system fracture, functional disorders, alcoholism, suicidal attempts, depression, incapacity for work and psychotic episodes can ensue.

In all neuroses the precipitating crisis is usually an event that provokes a disproportionate response. The detached-resigned has only one, quite unhelpful, coping device: flight. Horney explains: “To be more specific, in a difficult situation the person can neither appease nor fight, neither co-operate nor dictate terms, neither love nor be ruthless. He is as defenceless as an animal that has only one means of coping with danger- that is, to escape and hide.”¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 90.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 92.

Detachment-resignation is both a part of the basic conflict as well as protection against it. To add to the confusion is this type's swings between the repressed compliant-morbidly dependent and aggressive-vindictive types. In any case, he does not want to see himself as other than his idealized self, nor does he want to analyze his human relationships or face his conflicts. None of this matters anyway as long as a safe distance is kept from others. Horney observes that,

The all important function of neurotic detachment, then, is to keep major conflicts out of operation. It is the most radical and most effective of the defences erected against them. One of the many neurotic ways of creating artificial harmony, it is an attempt at solution through evasion. But it is no true solution because the compulsive cravings for closeness as well as for aggressive domination, exploitation, and excelling remain, and they keep harassing if not paralyzing their carrier. Finally, no real inner peace or freedom can ever be attained as long as the contradictory sets of values continue to exist.¹⁶⁵

In *Neurosis and Human Growth* Horney writes of the detached-resigned as resigning from active living, which, though the most radical of neurotic solutions, nonetheless passes for normal in American society because the "sense of what is healthy is generally blunted."¹⁶⁶ This neurotic's life is without pain, or friction, or zest. He lives in an aura of restrictions. Though he can describe his own intrapsychic life rather accurately, because that intrapsychic life is not felt, nothing can be changed. The detached-resigned assiduously avoids perceiving his own conflicts; not being an active player in his own life, these conflicts hold no interest. He does not strive for achievement and avoids effort. This individual refuses to acknowledge his own assets. What needs to be done is done with resistance, listlessly, ineffectively, and slowly. There are no plans for life. A pessimistic outlook on life is indicated by the restriction of wishes: it is better not to wish for or expect anything. The only wish is not to be bothered. No wishes: no effort. The basic neurotic claims, Horney notes, are that "life should be easy, painless and effortless and that he should not be bothered."¹⁶⁷ Even in an emergency it may not occur to this neurotic to seek

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 95.

¹⁶⁶ Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 259.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 264.

help. He is suspicious of any efforts by others to challenge his or her posture, not that the challenge would be tested out in any case. The more intense this neurotic's inertia the more intense is his resistance to change. The less he expects, the less he has to change. Horney adds,

But in all cases there is a marked aversion to inner changes. This applies in a way to all neuroses, but the aversion is usually one to the tackling and challenging of specific factors—mostly those pertaining to the particular main solution. This is equally true for the resigned type but, because of the static concept of self rooted in the nature of his solution, he is adverse to the very idea of change itself. The very essence of this solution is withdrawing from active living, from active wishing, striving, planning, from efforts and doing. His accepting others as unalterable is a reflection of his view of himself, no matter how much he may talk about evolution— or even intellectually appreciate the idea of it.¹⁶⁸

Compliant-morbidly dependent and aggressive-vindictive traits are equally influential in this type. The latter influence is seen in the detached-resigned's grandiose fantasies, feeling of superiority, self-sufficiency, and occasional open rebellion. The former is seen in a timid self-esteem, and hypersensitivity to the needs of others. He may be dedicated to a cause, self-blaming, and overanxious not to hurt others. However, neither the aggressive-vindictive goal of mastery, nor the compliant-morbidly dependent goal of love appeals to the detached-resigned type. Rather, he pursues the elimination of the active ingredients of both influences to eliminate conflicts within and without. This strategy immobilizes the idealized self's search for glory or actualization; it also immobilizes any possibility for the actualization of the real self this solution evolved to protect. This latter inconsistency is rationalized by an emphasis on being rather than on attaining or growing, a rationalization that will be closely scrutinized in Chapter Four when Daly's solution of biophilic be-ing is evaluated in light of the detached-resigned type.

Horney believes that the detached-resigned's goal is freedom:

In fact most of the basic characteristics which we have regarded from the viewpoint of resignation also make sense when seen from the viewpoint of freedom. Any stronger attachment would curtail his freedom. So would needs. He would be dependent upon

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 268.

such needs and they would easily make him dependent upon others too. If he devoted his energies to one pursuit, he would not be free to do many other things in which he might be interested. Particularly, his sensitivity to coercion appears in a new light. He wants to be free and hence will not tolerate pressure.¹⁶⁹

The irony of all this being free to do what he wishes when he wishes is that his wishes are frozen and usually not known. Thus freedom is reduced to the negative quality of being free from interference and needs.

In tracing the historical root of this solution Horney believes that the childhood of the detached-resigned individual has many cramping emotional influences, in which there is no room for the neurotic's self, feelings, beliefs and wishes because it was a "closed emotional corporation" or because the kind of affection received "repelled more than warmed him." Horney adds, "In short there was an environment which made explicit and implicit demands for him to fit in this way or that way and threatened to engulf him without sufficient regard for his individuality, not to speak of encouraging his personal growth."¹⁷⁰ Therefore, early on in life the detached-resigned withdraws from the conflict, giving up affection and struggling for this particular kind of neurotic safety: the preserving, in static form, of what he has of his real self. From time to time, especially during adolescence, this type may venture forth in a compliant-morbidly dependent or aggressive-vindictive mode, seeking friendship or the realization of an ambition, but the natural difficulties inherent in these pursuits frighten him back into detachment-resignation. Horney notes that the idealized self that emerges over time "chiefly, is a glorification of the needs which have developed. It is a composite of self-sufficiency, independence, self-contained serenity, freedom from desires and passions, stoicism and fairness."¹⁷¹ Fairness here is idealized non-commitment and the refusal to infringe on the rights of others.

The resigned-detached's shoulds protect him from the inner tyranny of the idealized self. Nonetheless he chafes under them as well because they are coercive. This neurotic copes with

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 274.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 275.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 277.

this through passive externalization: living up to the expectations of others is seen as absolutely imperative for the preservation from hostility of his non-involved presence in the world. His hypersensitivity to a feeling of external hostility, even in a very low stress environment, in turn intensifies the need to withdraw. Not surprisingly, this passive externalization generates new conflicts, new ambivalent responses, and renewed efforts at even greater withdrawal. Personal inertia both misleads this neurotic into believing that his situation is unalterable while keeping self-accusations and self-hate at bay, and it immobilizes the shoulds through further avoidance of situations that generate conflict.

Horney observes that the real integrity of the detached-resigned type is remarkable. "Detached, resigned people may be impractical, inert, inefficient, difficult to deal with because of their defiant wariness of influences and closer contact, but they possess - to a greater or lesser extent - an essential sincerity, an innocence in their innermost thoughts and feelings which are not to be bribed or corrupted by the lure of power, success, flattery, or 'love'."¹⁷² This neurotic is genuinely afraid of losing his true self which in this neurosis has become identified with the idealized self. This is a further obstruction to being effectively helped.

Horney completes her presentation on this type by describing three ways this neurotic adapts to living: either in persistent resignation, active rebellion, or shallow living. The first adaptation is rather much like what has been described so far. Horney adds that a lurking fear of futility may be dealt with by arranging a minimum of personal time. If aversion to work and inertia prevail, this person lives very simply and may do very little. If there is a pervasive inertia this individual may become very atrophied in the capacity for the most basic aspects of living.

In the second case the passive resistance and active rebellion of the aggressive-vindictive element is the key influence. If this response is against an external situation, it may be very negative, offensive, and militant, driving the individual further away from his real self. If the response is against the inner inertia, the realization that his life is going nowhere may cause a

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 280.

limited liberation and a movement toward growth. Horney, in keeping with her view of all efforts at resolving neuroses, emphasizes that this liberation is limited, because the whole structure of the detached-resigned solution needs to be addressed if a permanent and durable resolution is to be reached.

The final style of shallow living is a function of the individual's feeling of futility and his belief that life should be easy and painless. Horney notes that this detached-resigned type "deteriorates into unrelatedness."¹⁷³ and cynicism. He may emphasize fun, prestige or opportunistic success, or become a well-adapted chameleon. Horney argues, counter to Fromm, that shallow living is an expression of neurosis rather than an innate deficiency. She believes the distinction is important considering the degree of shallow living she observes in America. An evaluation of ill health at least leads to the possibility of a cure.

f) Resolving Neurotic Solutions

In the "Conclusion" of *Our Inner Conflicts*, and in Chapter 14 of *Neurosis and Human Growth* Horney outlines her beliefs about how neurotic solutions are resolved. The description in *Our Inner Conflicts*, like the text itself, is simple, clear, and straightforward. The description in *Neurosis and Human Growth*, while assuming and building on the theory in *Our Inner Conflicts*, is more complex, layered, and conscious of the limitations of any kind of theorizing.

Considering the failure of the neurotic solutions, Horney believes that "the conflicts can be resolved only by changing those conditions within the personality that brought them into being."¹⁷⁴ All the attempts at solution need to be dealt with before the basic conflicts within the protective pride system and between that system and the real self are tackled. Details of childhood are most important in terms of the origin of the neurotic structure; as long as the original conditions persist, the protective pride system will be immune to deconstruction. The goal of therapy has to be changing the original conditions so that the real self can be retrieved.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 286.

¹⁷⁴ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 217.

The steps to this change involve the analysis of the entire neurotic character structure. The first step is to analyze all the unconscious attempts at solution, all the implications of those attempts, and all the secondary elements supporting those attempted solutions. The second step is to work through the basic conflicts, first, in a kind of general outline, and then in detail. This is followed by a general review of the effect of these attempted solutions on the patient, and then an examination of his specific symptomatic responses.

Next, the patient needs to become aware of his varied resistances to change and growth. The analyst needs to learn the subjective values of the attitudes and trends that the patient defends. He or she needs to understand the patient's attempt to deny that conflicts are conflicts, and his attempt to blur and/or minimize the incompatibility of his neurotic drives.

Horney suggests that interpretations only be given when they will be profitable to the patient; something that can be borne at the time, and that will be perceived as meaningful and helpful. The idealized image must be approached gently. Sadistic trends need to be left until the patient feels less hopeless. The analyst has to realize that each character structure will have its own unique requirements regarding timing, and that that timing will be learned through trial and error with the patient's resistances giving the clues to direction and to what the patient can bear. Many approaches are needed for the same difficulty.

Any attitude that comes to light needs to be understood in relationship to the whole character structure. Horney advises that the analyst proceed as follows: bring all hidden and overt manifestations of the neurotic solution into awareness; explore their compulsive nature; examine their subjective value and adverse consequences; underline their historical realization; attend to their divisiveness and indiscriminate nature and to the patient's reaction to their frustration; and weigh their subjective value in counterbalancing other neurotic trends. Horney believes that the most important step is for the neurotic to see "the incapacitating effects of his neurotic drives and conflicts...Only then will the patient feel the need for changing...such an incentive, however, can come only from his desire for inner freedom, happiness, and growth, and from the realization that

every neurotic difficulty stands in the way of its fulfillment.”¹⁷⁵ The last step is to examine the influence that the basic conflicts have on the patient’s life.

Neurotics resist change because they feel too hopeless, or wish to triumph over those who challenge them to change. Or their externalizations may be overpowering, and thus override the application of any insight. In addition, the need to feel omnipotent may be too great or the idealized self may be too rigid.

Horney does not believe that what she has presented by way of strategies for resolving neurotic solutions and the conflicts embedded in them is a treatise on analytic techniques. It is her experience that these are the essential processes an analyst goes through each time a new trend or conflict in the solution emerges. She believes that each piece of analytical work that is done well has a positive effect on the diminution of the whole neurotic structure. The hostility that the neurotic feels about being challenged to change diminishes with his decreased feeling of helplessness. His strength increases with each additional feeling of connection to his real self. He feels more creative, and can set his own values. He has more energy and is less inhibited and less paralyzed by fears, hopelessness, and self-hate.

Therapy undoes neurotic solutions bit by bit. It is a hard, painful process that takes time: brief therapies are wishful thinking on the part of their originators. Day to day living can itself be therapeutic depending on the persons met and on the events in the neurotic’s life. Analysis can be terminated when the patient can learn from his own experience and can examine his own share in the difficulties, and apply these insights to his life.

The goals this process envisions for the neurotic are: an ability to assume responsibility for himself, making his own decisions and taking the consequences; a willingness to accept whatever responsibility he has for others; a determination to be obligated by his values; an inner independence; a respect for others and himself within a democratic framework; a spontaneity of feelings with a corresponding capacity to control these feelings; a capacity for love and friendship

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 233-234.

for its own sake; and a capacity for wholeheartedness. Horney believes, in light of her experience that patients can change, that these goals are elements of psychic health and are within the range of possibility for the patient. The goals are ideals to strive for and guideposts for directing one's life. Horney is concerned that if there are not clear, healthy ideals, then the idealized self will easily reactivate itself and set the neurosis in motion again.

In *Neurosis and Human Growth* Horney begins by warning against a false optimism concerning "quick and easy cures."¹⁷⁶ She points out that the word 'cure' is applicable to symptoms, and that analysis is concerned with correcting a whole way of life that is misdirected. Regarding the neurotic, she observes that "We can only help assist him in gradually outgrowing his difficulties so that his development may assume a more constructive course."¹⁷⁷ About her summary in this text, she writes,

I am not sure that this brief presentation...conveys the extent and the intensity of the influence which intrapsychic processes have on human relations. When we realize its full impact we must modify certain expectations, commonly harbored, as to the beneficial effect which better human relations can exercise on neurosis- or, in a broader sense, on a person's development...In analytical therapy this expectation is expressed in the belief that the principal curative factor lies in the possibility of the patient's establishing a good relationship with the analyst, i.e., one in which the factors that were injurious in childhood are absent...All these expectations are justified with regard to the child and the adolescent...depending upon the extent of the disturbance in the individual and on the duration, quality, and intensity of the good human influence.

Such a beneficial effect upon the person's inner growth may also take place in adults, provided the pride system and its consequences are not too deeply ingrained... But these possibilities are much more limited than is usually assumed.¹⁷⁸

Horney notes in *Our Inner Conflicts* that the focus is on rehabilitating the neurotic's relationships with others. In this text, she explains that,

Having seen the nature and the importance of intrapsychic processes, we are now inclined to formulate the aim in a more inclusive way. We want the patient to find himself, and

¹⁷⁶ Horney. *Neurosis and Human Growth*, p. 333.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 306-307.

with that the possibility of working toward his self-realization. His capacity for good human relations is an essential part of his self-realization, but it also includes his faculty for creative work and that of assuming responsibility for himself.¹⁷⁹

She notes that it has to be clear to the analyst that the patient holds on to his particular solution and values because they are all he has to cling to. In his eyes, they are all that protect him from self-disintegration. The neurotic thus endeavours to keep his conflicts unconscious, or incomprehensible by intellectualizing, compartmentalizing, and being cynical. The central issue is warding off self-hate by avoiding any recognition of unfulfilled shoulds. This need along with the need to keep his feelings of inner terror at bay, impair his capacity to cooperate in his own growth.

The analyst needs to be able to distinguish the idealized self from the real self, and the role that pride plays in maintaining the former. The secret expectations of the neurotic for a removal of symptoms without a change in character, and his hope that therapy would better enable him to actualize his idealized self has to be faced. In addition, all the difficulties the patient has in his ordinary relationships are experienced with the analyst. The patient overrates the significance of the analyst regarding her magical power to cure him and her capacity to humiliate and hurt him. The neurotic's defences impede and sometimes make impossible any growth. They also indicate to the analyst what the neurotic needs to protect or enhance. The patient is not only warding off awareness of his conflicts and their supportive element, he is also warding off the interconnection of these factors. Horney believes that the patient's recognition that he cannot have his pride without his self-hate to be of the utmost importance.

Knowledge of the basic conflicts and their supporting structure is not sufficient. The neurotic has to experience these, otherwise he can apply his insights to others but not to himself: "seeing is solving"¹⁸⁰ is not growth producing. Horney explains:

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 334.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 343.

It is not enough to know vaguely that his anger or self reproach is probably greater than warranted by the occasion. He must feel the full impact of his rage or the very depths of his self-condemnation: only then does the force of some unconscious process (and its irrationality) stare him in the face. Only then may he have an incentive to find out more and more about himself.¹⁸¹

If the patient does not experience certain emotions, like anger, the analyst has to be sure the patient knows that he can express those feelings within the therapeutic context. In addition the analyst must analyze those factors that could be interfering, like the patient's ability to suspend judgement.

The protective pride system cannot be dismantled without inner change. Certain ideas about the self have to be seen as fantastic and certain expectations of self and others as impossible. The neurotic has to realize that he is not so independent, or honest, or so masterful even in his own house and that much of his loving is compulsive and exploitative. Certain values have to be questioned too. He needs to see that self-reproaches are not great moral sensibility, that cynicism is not objectivity, that his worldly wisdom that others are crooks is invalid, that his detachment involves great losses and that his neurotic solution is not the answer to everything.

Analysis of the protective pride system requires of the analyst, Horney believes, "a training in technical skills, an extensive knowledge of possible unconscious complexities and personal ingenuity in discovering, understanding, connecting."¹⁸² A knowledge of how dreams function is essential. The analyst should be a constructive person with a clear vision and a desire to help the patient find himself. The analyst has to capitalize on the initial interest of the patient, however neurotic it may be, and encourage the neurotic in any efforts he makes on behalf of his own growth. The work is hard and upsetting for the neurotic, but it is also freeing. As the conflict within the protective pride system deflates and crumbles, the opportunity for actualization of the real self emerges.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 348.

The work on the conflict between the protective pride system and the real self is the most turbulent part of the analysis. Horney observes:

It is at bottom this question: does the patient want to keep whatever is left of the grandeur and glamour of his illusions, his claims, and his false pride or can he accept himself as a human being with all the general limitations this implies, and with his special difficulties but also with the possibility of his growth? There is, I gather, no more fundamental crossroad situation in our life than this one.¹⁸³

The ups and downs in this phase are rapid and intense and the attacks of self-hate are vicious. The patient both overrates and underrates his progress. Bouts of accepting limitations are quickly followed by bouts of rejecting them. Horney refers to all this as the growing pains that the analyst has to be able to recognize and support. Over time, the constructive periods are longer and more positive and the patient can do more work on his own. He slowly comes to see that he does not need his neurotic props, and this realization strengthens his self-confidence. The more he experiences being in accord with his real self the greater incentive there is to move even more in this direction. Yet Horney warns: "The therapeutic process is so fraught with difficulties of manifold kinds that the patient may not attain the stage described."¹⁸⁴

In this final text, Horney sees the question of termination of analysis in a much more nuanced way. Though the patient may become increasingly able to do more work on his own, this does not mean that analysis should be terminated. The neurotic is only beginning to change his values, directions, and goals. The work still to be done involves working through hidden kinds of pride, claims, pretensions, and externalizations. In addition the work of self-realization has to be done with its clearer and deeper experiencing of feelings, wishes, and beliefs and its greater ability to use the patient's resources for growth. The work has to be seen by the patient as "an integral part of living."¹⁸⁵ and the patient has to move from seeing himself as a unique exception to seeing himself as part of the world at large with a responsibility in it.

¹⁸³ Ibid., pp. 356-357.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 364.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 364.

Daly's and Horney's psychological paradigms have been presented in detail. I will now assess and evaluate Daly's psychological paradigm in light of Horney. In so doing I will be simultaneously assessing and evaluating Daly's translation of her ontology into psychological description and her politics into the etiology of psychological pathology.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE MESHING AND CLASHING OF PARADIGMS

This chapter will appraise and critique Mary Daly's psychological descriptions of patriarchal pathology and biophilic health by comparing and contrasting her ideas with Karen Horney's descriptions of pathology and health. In order to make this comparison I will draw on the information presented in detail in Chapters Two and Three, presenting it more succinctly. The comparison of Daly's patriarchal male with Horney's aggressive-vindictive type is rather straightforward. The comparison and contrast of the patriarchal woman and the compliant-morbidly dependent type and the Biophilic woman with the detached-resigned type are more complex and will be presented in detail.

4.1 The Patriarchal Male and the Aggressive-Vindictive Neurotic Solution

Upon reviewing Horney's description of the aggressive-vindictive pathological type I found there to be roughly sixteen characteristic ways this type uses to maintain the idealized self. He or she has a conscious or unconscious feeling of superiority, the desire to master life, the determination to overcome all obstacles - inner and outer, along with a dread of helplessness and a determination for self-glorification, usually through ambitious pursuits and vindictive triumph. There are also the desire to achieve mastery through intellect and will, a rigid and compulsive repression of the compliant-morbidly dependent trend resulting in the externalization of undesired traits onto others, and a pretence at being all-knowing, loving, generous, and wise. There is a pride in deceiving others with concomitant contempt of them. There is a fear of being deceived by them resulting in excruciating humiliation that can cause disintegration of the pathological structure because of the emergence of self-contempt. There is the fear of being a fraud in regard to real abilities with the resultant hypersensitivity to criticism and fear of failure, a narcissistic

relationship with the idealized self, an inability to ask for or to receive, the choking off of all feeling, and motivation fueled by a need to prove self-worth. Finally there is a fear of retaliation for using others, a fear of others interfering with their being used, the presence of powerful impulses and insufficient checks, and extreme competitiveness.

There is much in this description that can be readily identified with what Daly has to say about patriarchal male pathology. Daly goes to great lengths to describe the unbridled narcissism and feeling of superiority characteristic of the patriarchal male from his claims of divinity through the divine male line with its attendant prerogatives, to the self-contemplation of this divinity in every ideology he has created, religious and secular. This narcissism and feeling of superiority express themselves in several other Horneyan traits. The patriarchal male is obsessed with mastering life - his and that of every other human being, especially and particularly women. He also would master all other living things and the cosmos itself. He pursues this through all his ideologies, his construction of language, his definition of the being of others, in particular women's being. He co-opts others to help him destroy women's selves. He rapes their bodies and their minds. He believes he can overcome all obstacles to attain this mastery and he works toward the annihilation of all that would oppose his necrophilic self-absorption, including particularly women and all else that lives on the planet. This self-mastery is intended to achieve his central ambition, his self-glorification. Vindictive triumph, sadism and misogyny, gynocide and genocide, every kind of demeaning ideology are the tools of his extreme competitiveness in this quest to achieve his every ambition.

The patriarchal male takes great pride in deceiving others through religious myths like that of Mary and Eve, and religious doctrines like those about the nature of women, and those about

sin and salvation. These doctrines represent some of the Biggest Lies that hide the sadospirituality and sadoideology of the fathers, sons and holy ghosts. What he has learned from religion he has translated into the secular ideologies of politics and philosophy, medicine and psychotherapy all carefully crafted to keep women permanently ensconced in the 'looking glass society'.

The patriarchal male's repressed feelings are projected onto women, who introject them and in so doing collude with patriarchal men in creating a planet of dissociated men and women. This dissociated state, the sadostate, is declared normative and healthy by patriarchal men.

In all of this the patriarchal male is a pathological mix of powerful impulses out of control. He is treacherous and violent in every way imaginable, a rapist, torturer, dismemberer, necrophilic to the core of his being, lecherous through and through.

However, Daly's description bypasses the characteristics in Horney's description that deal with the aggressive-vindictive's vulnerability and general predicament. Daly does not write about the patriarchal male's dread of helplessness, or his fear of being deceived by others with its humiliating and self-contemptuous consequences. Nor does she address his fear of being fraudulent regarding real abilities, or his need to prove his self-worth, or inability to ask for or to receive. Nor does she confront directly the psychological reality that any doubt of the right to appropriate what has been claimed could result in very serious psychological disintegration, from psychosis to suicide. In as much as Daly fails to address the patriarchal male's vulnerability and his plight, Daly's description of the patriarchal male pathology, in comparison to Horney's, has to be judged at the least as limited and at the worst as one-sided, and unbalanced. Added to this is

Daly's failure to portray these particular human beings as persons every bit as worthy of assistance and compassion as any other human beings.

4.2 The Patriarchal Female and the Compliant-Morbidly Dependent Neurotic Solution

Things are not straightforward in this comparison, largely because Daly exonerates the patriarchal woman of her responsibility for her condition. Whereas Daly emphasizes the hidden aggressive-vindictive aspects of the patriarchal woman's symbiotic relationship with the patriarchal male, she does not hold the patriarchal women ultimately responsible for these aspects of her behaviour. Of the eighteen characteristics of this neurotic condition that I gleaned from Horney's writings, Daly uses two as her principal descriptors, three others secondarily, that is significantly but less frequently, seven others occasionally, and the rest not at all.

The first principal descriptor Daly uses is the symbiotic relationship of the patriarchal female to the patriarchal male and its consequences: the deeply hidden nature of the patriarchal woman's wish for vengeance and vindictive triumph; the secret admiration of aggressive-vindictive vices that are consciously abhorred; the choice of an aggressive vindictive partner to live out her aggressive-vindictiveness vicariously with the consequent failure to perceive the abusive nature of the relationship or to care if she does see it at the same time as she secretly collaborates with it - whitewashing the patriarchal male and abjectly serving him; and the neurotic longing for surrender and unity that leads her into this kind of relationship in the first place. The only characteristic of this descriptor not found in Daly's patriarchal female is the secret admiration of aggressive-vindictive vices that are consciously abhorred. Like the other absent descriptors, this one would interfere with Daly's exoneration of her ultimately innocent patriarchal woman.

The other principal descriptor is the shrinking of the real potential of the compliant-morbidly dependent patriarchal woman whose own aliveness is squelched, leaving her a helpless prey to self-hate.

The secondary descriptors that Daly uses are the insatiable need for affection, approval and safety; the subordination of self to others; and the idealization of what this neurotic believes to be positive qualities. And here there is a snag: it appears that the agent who idealizes in Daly's work is Daly herself, not Daly's patriarchal woman.

Daly's occasional descriptors are the compliant-morbidly dependent's need for a constantly available partner, the lack of awareness of the intrinsic worth of others, the indiscriminate and compulsive nature of needs, the central need for belonging and the total orientation toward safety, the lack of boundaries, terror of rejection, and admission of exaggerated guilt.

The neurotic characteristics of this type not used are the compliant-morbidly dependent's overrating of her congeniality, generosity, goodness, humility, sympathy and sensitivity; her belief that her suffering and helplessness justify her claims; the rationalizing of her aggressive-vindictive outbursts as upsets, or depression through which she accuses others and excuses herself and her lack of achievement; the emotional breakdown and possible suicide if the environment fails to support her neurotic posture; and the neurotic goal of absolute harmony for which she feels totally responsible. It is on this point that Daly's exoneration of the patriarchal female really shines through. Interestingly, in her description of the patriarchal male, Daly leaves out neurotic descriptors that would invoke sympathy for his suffering; here she omits neurotic descriptors that would hold patriarchal women responsible for their own neurotic posture.

i) The Principal Descriptors

The consequences of the symbiotic relationship of the patriarchal female with the patriarchal male can be seen in the patriarchal woman's identification with the aggressor. This causes a divided self that lives through the patriarchal male and is allowed a feeling of achievement only if her achievements reflect his glory. She is drained and trapped by the patriarchal male and she is blind to the fact that he is the real agent of her misery. She lives in a state of Robotitude, the state of the living dead; and her life is reduced to servitude to him. She identifies with the patriarchal male aggressor, allowing him to dictate who she is. He thus controls her psyche, setting her up to crave his patriarchal products: romantic love and marriage, religion, professional help, alcohol and pills. She internalizes this raping, battering patriarchal male who evokes constant internal and external terror that is reinforced by the multiple overt and covert sadistic messages of "submit or else." She is the victim of his Biggest Lies that leaves her dissociated from herself, grateful for patriarchal crumbs, and totally ignorant of herself, her victimization, and her rights. She ingests the lies of the perpetrator of the Biggest Lies, the Papal Mother. She lives in a house of Sado-ascetic mirrors becoming a saintly masochist full of self-hate, a need for punishment, and horizontal violence. Her complicity in adoring the false self that the patriarchal male has created for her destroys her core integrity. The destroyed-restored patriarchal woman is a patriarchal clone who settles for peripheral improvements in exchange for silence. Her identification with the aggressor exacts an ongoing confession of sins that he has defined; this act of self-loathing is rewarded by emotional catharsis and relief from guilt. Her feelings are experienced indirectly and vicariously. The masochistic self-sacrifice of the Christian woman who identifies with the aggressor's causes, brings about her own demise. She is tricked

into hating other women in exchange for a vicarious outlet for her own anxiety, hate, and rage, but the price is rape, battery and incest. The patriarchal woman who identifies with the aggressor fears separation from him above all things, failing to realize that she has never been anything but separate from him and herself, and that she has been living in a dissociated state. The patriarchal Presence of Absence becomes in her the Presence of Absence of her Self. She suffers brain prostitution, and even though the patriarchal deception is brazenly obvious and easily detectable, her addictive symbiosis destroys the emotional distance required to see the obvious.

The prohibition against aggressive behaviour is seen clearly in most of the patriarchal woman's pseudo and plastic passions: guilt, anxiety, depression, bitterness, resentment, frustration, boredom, resignation, and fulfillment. The patriarchal woman's hostility is repressed against the real agent and unconsciously expressed against herself and other women. Daly describes these as masochistic emotions because the patriarchal woman can not name the real aggressor and thus can not break away from patriarchy. As a result she becomes twisted in on herself, paralyzed, and resigned to her fate, craving male approval that offers her fulfillment, a perversion of joy. A depressed woman is the perfect receptor for patriarchal products. Her potted passions are not much help either, fragmenting and distorting her psyche, and concealing her real passion.

The deeply hidden nature of the patriarchal women's wish for vengeance and vindictive triumph is seen in her long historical participation in the Sado-Ritual Syndrome that has made her abet in her own fate and that of other women; a victim and a victimizer who performs her role as token woman uncritically, assenting to her spiritual rape and reproducing the myth of male divinity. As a masochist, she becomes the torturer of other women, concealing the patriarchal

male agent, and living unconsciously and vicariously her hidden aggressive-vindictiveness. She spreads that patriarchal male ideology that women love to be degraded. As a pseudo feminist she spreads horizontal violence and blames the victim instead of naming the agent. She makes feminism feel like an illusion and that drives other women back into patriarchy. She betrays other women out of a false loyalty to patriarchy and because of her fear of the consequences of being loyal to other women. As a token woman she regurgitates male scholarship uncritically in gratitude for male support and in her desire for unity with him and at the cost of recovering women's lost past.

The shrinking of the real potential of the compliant-morbidly dependent patriarchal woman and the concomitant self-hate can be read between the lines of the presentation of the first principal descriptor. But Daly adds more. The patriarchal woman lives in a vicious circle of self-fulfilling prophesy and self-hate. She is alienated, polarized, and appears inadequate in all male arrogated areas. She internalizes male projected self-hate along with her own, and is then victimized by him, herself, and other women. She is too busy meeting patriarchal male needs to see to her own needs and potential. She is seen as being trivial, diffuse, dependent, low in self-esteem, and powerless. She is autoallergic, working on her own self-destruction, suffocating her own process, choking her own becoming, and hiding her own knowing. She is tamed, domesticated, harnessed, meek, subdued, and disloyal to herself and other women. She doubts the validity of her own being, and that of other women's. In her self-hatred she self-lobotomizes, allowing men to drain all her energy. As a saintly masochist, she lives out her self-hatred, need for punishment and horizontal violence. As a masosadist she is radically passive, unable or unwilling to resist oppression, and incapable of moral outrage. She wastes energy on patriarchal

pseudo problems. Her wasted life is the solid waste of the sadosociety. She becomes more and more stereotypical, a product of patriarchal religion, psychology, pornography, fashions, films, television, commercials, news and drama. There is a vacuum where her Self should be. She is a vassal of the patriarchal male as a pornographic model, a prostitute, a pious adherent of patriarchal religion. She is a vessel of self-hatred cut off from her own strengths.

ii) The Secondary Descriptors

Daly uses some descriptors that are similar to Horney's in a significant but less obvious role than the principal descriptors presented above. The patriarchal female has an insatiable need for affection, approval, and safety. Daly describes the patriarchal woman in an increasingly conservative society as having an obsessive-compulsive need for safety, shelter, rules and love, and as being in terror of losing these things along with her sanity. She has a false need to be loved that leads to living and loving lies.

The patriarchal woman subordinates herself to others. She takes for granted that others are more worthwhile. Her self-esteem rises and falls according to the evaluation of the patriarchal others. She allows herself to appear inadequate in the areas patriarchal males have claimed solely for themselves. She projects all value onto the patriarchal male. She occupies herself with serving his needs. She finds peace in patriarchal religion by blinding herself to the inequalities it perpetrates. She is grateful for patriarchal crumbs. She regurgitates male scholarship uncritically. She displaces the source of her self-esteem to others.

As indicated earlier the self-idealization of the patriarchal woman is a problem. In Daly's paradigm it is she who is idealizing the patriarchal woman. Daly's construction of the patriarchal

woman's pathology leaves the patriarchal woman the victim of the patriarchal male pathology with little real responsibility for her own pathology. Patriarchal women are not to blame for their transgressions; these are only a result of the patriarchal structure with which they have been forced to comply. Patriarchal mothers are socialized to kill the autonomy in their daughters, the subordinate woman being the patriarchal ideal. The false patriarchal self is idealized at the expense of the genuine Self thanks to the malevolence of the patriarchal fathers, sons, and holy ghosts. They make the restored, fulfilled patriarchal woman the ideal patriarchal object. This is not at all what Horney has in mind when she writes about how the compliant-morbidly dependent neurotic idealizes her false self. It is an unconscious act on the part of the neurotic, initially to survive childhood, and later to maintain the neurotic structure initiated in childhood. Whereas it is initiated because of neurotic parenting, Horney does not see it as a product of the neurotic parent, but as a creation of the compliant-morbidly dependent person, for which she has to take responsibility. Over time this neurotic enters into a complicity with what initially was created in childhood out of basic anxiety. However, for Horney there is a point at which parental responsibility becomes the neurotic's responsibility. Horney does not blame one side, exonerating the other. She calls all to take responsibility for their own part in the pathology.

iii) The Occasional Descriptors

The first infrequently used descriptor is the compliant-morbidly dependent's need for a constantly available partner. Daly writes of the patriarchal woman's dependence on others for her self-definition and her reliance on the patriarchal male for approval and protection. As a token woman she aids him in spreading the adoration of the patriarchally created false female self.

Because the patriarchal woman looks to others for her self-esteem she becomes an intolerable burden on others and is rejected by them. Secondly, the intrinsic worth of others is not of concern to her. Patriarchal mothers kill the autonomy in their daughters. As a token woman she participates in horizontal violence against other women. As a masosadist she destroys herself and other women. Thirdly her needs are compulsive and indiscriminate, generating anxiety and despondence when they are frustrated. Daly notes the triviality and diffuseness of patriarchal women, who believe that only patriarchal men can protect them from other patriarchal men. Because the connection between the patriarchal woman and other women is broken, she suffers a chronic and acute anger that immobilizes and defeats her. She is dissociated from her Self and transformed into a robotic false self at the service of the patriarchal male. She is grateful for patriarchal crumbs. She is an intolerable burden of need. Her central need for belonging and total safety can be seen in her need for others to define her self, and in her obsessive-compulsive need for safety, shelter, rules and love. She blames herself for being raped, blurring the boundaries between herself and the attacker, unable to distinguish Self and its motives from the attacker's. She lives in extreme fear of rejection: the rejection that results from pathological dependence and that which she fears would result if she abandoned the patriarchy in search of her real Self. Finally, she admits to an exaggerated guilt, be it for rape that she did not entice, or through obsession with purification by confession. She is guilt ridden thanks to the patriarchal myth of the Fall. She feels guilty simply for being alive as a woman.

iv) The Exoneration of the Patriarchal Female

Adding to the difficulty of easily perceiving the parallel character structure of Daly's patriarchal female with Horney's compliant-morbidly dependent type is Daly's choice of the patriarchal religious mythical figure, the Virgin Mary, to highlight and champion the plight of the patriarchal female. As can be seen from what follows, Mary, like all patriarchal women, is portrayed by Daly as bearing no real responsibility for her predicament and as displaying none of the neurotic characteristics that would reflect such a lack of responsibility.

The compliant-morbidly dependent woman effaces and erases her Self. Mary does the same. She has no role in the conception of Jesus. Her body is unchanged. The holy ghost does it all. The father is the only true parent, the only true self, the only creative self. Mary, and thus all women, are mere vessels for male creativity.

The dominant partner expects to have full control of the compliant partner. The latter is to be abject in the former's presence, bearing all the blame, inhibiting all healthy ambitious striving, creativity, leadership, self-assertion and critique. Mary fits into all these categories. She is raped in mind, spirit, and will, by a refined religious rapism. She consents to the rape and worships its product. Mary as the new Eve is the old Eve; it is the rejected and banished Lilith who is the autonomous one.

The symbiotic connection deprives the compliant partner of her own agency. Mary has no agency. Jesus' real birth is his baptism by John; his supreme rebirth is his resurrection.

The compliant partner is blind to the dominant partner's ambivalence, is helpless and expects to suffer and to be the latter's despised image of himself. The compliant partner is unaware of the dominant's sadistic hatred, her own perpetual victimhood and total rape. Mary is

compliant, blind, helpless and left to suffer. She has no idea of the tyrannical trinity's hatred of her. She does not see that Jesus replaces Persephone and herself as the rising goddess. And even though, like Dionysus, Jesus confers immortality on his mother when she is assumed into heaven, unlike Semele who is her own woman, Mary is crushed and catatonic.

The compliant-morbidly dependent's real self is crushed under the burden of the sadistic partner's idealized self. Mary's real Self is erased through the incarnation: a mythic super-rape which legitimizes the rape of all matter and all women. Further, the Protestants erase Mary because they think that she is made more powerful than Jesus. Roman Catholics keep and vampirize her.

The dogma of the Immaculate Conception (and the founding of gynecology) were responses to the first wave of feminism. Women, like Mary, are presented as totally dependent on male grace; women and Mary can be nothing without men. Mary was conveniently relieved of her real self before she had a chance to experience it. This is the intended fate of all women under patriarchy. Women are only to see and experience the world through patriarchal eyes. Those who rebel are murdered and maimed and otherwise marginalized. In light of this Daly concludes that theology is pornography because it supports the emptying of women for the use of men as token women, male implants, to suppress all other women, as Mary has been used to suppress all Christian women.

Identifying the fate of patriarchal women with that of Mary seems, on the one hand, to sanitize them of their real contribution to their own pathology and their responsibility for that, and on the other hand to put them onto a pedestal, with Mary, beyond the stain of mortal existence, and as Daly declares, into a species different from the totally demented and evil patriarchal male.

I believe that both the use of Mary in this manner, and the general exoneration of women from ultimate responsibility for their sadomasochism, considerably weakens Daly's presentation of the psychology of patriarchal women.

4.3 The Biophilic Woman and the Detached-Resigned Neurotic Solution

The understanding of the meshing and clashing of Daly and Horney's psychological paradigms is complex. On the surface it appears that there are few points of contact between Horney's description of the detached-resigned neurotic and Daly's Biophilic woman. But a greater appreciation of the details and subtleties of Horney's description of this neurotic behaviour discloses Daly's construct as severely flawed.

The detached-resigned person has a core of static integrity, and there is real and ironically static integrity in Daly's Biophilic woman; the irony being that Daly uses so many energetic adjectives to describe the Biophilic woman. Within the detached-resigned type there is an equal struggle between the repressed aggressive-vindictive strivings and the compliant-morbidly dependent ones. Certainly by her construction in *Pure Lust* the Biophilic woman could be seen as aggressive-vindictive in her monolithic hatred of the patriarchal male. But the compliant-morbidly dependent aspect is absent. Interestingly, the patriarchal woman bears that aspect totally, not only for the Biophilic woman but also for the aggressive-vindictive patriarchal male. This is not surprising because Horney sees any sliding into the compliant-morbidly dependent traits as the absolute self-betrayal for the detached-resigned type. It is such self-betrayal that might lead to psychic breakdown and possibly suicide.

Many of the major characteristics of the detached-resigned type like the compulsive need for solitude and self-sufficiency with the concomitant belief in an idealized self and attendant behaviours like the search for glory, the compulsive shoulds, the balancing of the aggressive-vindictive and the compliant-morbidly dependent strivings, result in the creation of a mental and physical cocoon or magic circle as Horney calls it. The magic circle is the place of flight. It is also the place of that precious, if static, original integrity. When Daly's Biophilic woman is examined as an idealized self in search of glory, tyrannized by a set of shoulds, and exhibiting aggressive-vindictive traits to the exclusion of any compliant-morbidly dependent ones, ensconced in a magic circle - the chosen destination of her flight - the alignment between the two paradigmatic descriptions becomes very clear.

Other characteristics of the detached-resigned type like numbness to emotional experience, the avoidance of structures, the cherishing of unchangeability, the self as an object of study and the consequences of the shattering of the magic circle which do not appear to be characteristic of Daly's Biophilic woman on first glance, are there nonetheless, as will be shown in what follows.

In order to illustrate the meshing and clashing of paradigms presented above, I will present the comparison and contrast in two phases. The first phase will deal with the major issue of a magic circle enclosing an idealized self in flight and in search for glory, tyrannized by its shoulds, exhibiting its aggressive-vindictive suppressed side, and its core of integrity. The second phase will deal with those other characteristics of the detached-resigned type that seem absent from the magic circle but are there nonetheless.

a) The Magic Circle and its Concomitant Parts

i) The Magic Circle

The magic circle of Daly's Biophilic woman is the Background; this is the destination of her "flight" in Horney's terms, her "Journey" in Daly's. For Daly it is a Journey from which the Biophilic woman is not to allow herself to be distracted because it is the Journey to her Original Self, to the place of Be-ing and Participation in Be-ing. In Horneyan terms the Journey to the Background on the periphery of the patriarchal sado-state is an example of the kind of neurotic flight in which the detached-resigned type engages. The Background is a place of hiding for the Biophilic woman who refuses to engage in the world as either an appeaser or a fighter. This flight keeps the major conflicts with modern society, or the Foreground as Daly labels it, out of operation. Horney believes flight is the most radical and effective defence against this conflict. She also believes that because flight is both part of the basic conflict and the defence against it, the situation of this neurotic is more complex than that of the other two. Daly would also seem to believe that the Journey/flight is the most radical and effective defence against the conflicts a woman faces in the everyday patriarchal world. And if Horney is correct in her analysis that flight is both intrinsic to the basic conflict the detached-resigned Biophilic woman experiences as well as the basic defence against it, then Daly's failure to recognize that her prescription of the Journey as cure to be a neurotic solution is perhaps more understandable.

Horney suggests that even though the flight is the most radical and effective defence against the conflicts of everyday life, it still does not offer real peace and freedom because there is a contradictory set of values at work in the aggressive-vindictive and compliant-morbidly dependent neurotic components that are suppressed. The grandiose fantasies, feelings of

superiority, pursuit of self-sufficiency and occasional open rebellion of the aggressive-vindictive traits all seep through. This will be quite obvious in the description of the Biophilic woman's idealized self in pursuit of glory. The totally denied compliant-morbidly dependent traits are present in their projection onto the patriarchal woman, toward whom the Biophilic woman as member of the cognitive minority has a perilously patronizing approach. There can be no peace or freedom for the Biophilic woman. Horney sees a great irony in the detached-resigned's goal of freedom. It is not a "freedom for" because the wishes of this type are usually not known or frozen. Rather it is a freedom from intolerable pressure. In as much as Daly's Biophilic woman is frozen in the magic circle of the Background, her wishes, however elaborately expressed, are too.

Further, the magic circle/Background is the home of the Biophilic cognitive minority, a species absolutely different from the necrophilic patriarchal male majority. Daly describes it as a "province of the mind...[a] sacred space...of self actualization and transcendence..."¹ as participation in Be-ing, as a place of security and identity, as invincible and inviolable to all except the cognitive minority, as a moving centre instead of a dead Archimedean centre, or as a place apart from the dissociated sado-society. For Daly it is also a place of presentient presence, Archimagical Rites, and radically unpredictable behaviour that is beyond control. The cognitive minority evoke the reign of Nemesis causing the patriarchal order to self-destruct. There is almost a flavour here of a children's fairy tale in which the wicked witch or the evil giant is outwitted and self-destructs as punishment. As well, the rediscovery of the early relationship with the mother as one of nurturing freedom prior to the feminization by patriarchy that later invokes the reign of Nemesis in the Background, takes place and seems to be part of the fairy tale

¹ Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 34

template. In Horneyan terms, this home of the cognitive minority is a place largely beyond the realm of overwhelming conflicts, and the emotional untidiness of everyday life. It is a place where the detached-resigned Biophilic woman withdraws to work on herself, gives up dreams in the everyday world, expecting nothing from it. The worst aberration, the ultimate treachery would be, in Daly's terms, to seek any sympathy or help in the everyday patriarchal world: all healing, all growth, all fulfillment of dreams can take place only in the Background because the goal of anything patriarchal is the destruction of women and the death of the cosmos.

ii) The Idealized Self and the Search for Glory

The consideration of the idealized self that inhabits the detached-resigned's magic circle presents a few initial difficulties. Because Daly is a philosopher one could argue for her right to speak in ideal images. However, because Daly chooses to engage in a very psychological discourse in her description of the Biophilic woman, her possible immunity to a psychological reality check must be set aside. A second difficulty is that Daly weaves the ideal and the possibly pursuable in an almost seamless discourse. This increases the importance of observing what is not included in her description of the Biophilic woman: her ordinary flawed humanity. It is also important to realize that the possibly pursuable in the context of the magic circle-Background is the static integrity of the detached-resigned type.

Horney describes the idealized self of the detached-resigned type as self-contained, peaceful, and strong. This type believes in a kind of fairness that amounts to idealized non-commitment. This type thrives on independence, the idealized pursuit of freedom, and identification with the idealized self.

Daly's Biophilic woman is strong and self-contained, in the magic circle-Background. She is strong enough to move beyond the everyday world of patriarchy, and she has the courage to face non-being of that world so that she can participate in the Be-ing of the magic-circle Background. In Horneyan terms this would appear to be exchanging one false self for another, and the patriarchal god for another false god.

In the Background the Biophilic woman works to find her Self, leaving men and children to find their selves without her participation. She spooks patriarchal males, sparks female friendships and spins her own species and a radical feminist vision of the cosmos which excludes patriarchal males and patronizes patriarchal females, and never mentions children. This is typical of the detached-resigned type's capacity to create a fantasy world of self-pursuit and imaginary triumphs that become a substitute for successes and failures in everyday life.

In Horneyan terms the fairness of the Biophilic woman is only an idealized non commitment, because the Background is a magical, unreal place with no real moral obligating power. The Biophilic woman places herself in the Background, in Horneyan terms, to avoid engagement with the world of everyday life. Whereas Horney sees the detached-resigned as idealizing non commitment to avoid engagement, Daly's Biophilic woman rationalizes her non engagement in the everyday world by saying it has nothing to offer, and that its inhabitants are a different species than she is. She need only be fair to other women.

Daly's Biophilic woman is almost absolutely independent. She withdraws from the everyday world and must make it alone as a condition of making connections with any other woman. She is responsible for her own emancipation from patriarchy. She must be her own source of self-esteem. She must be her own agent of healing, and she must discover that in

herself she is a separate species with her own inner code. All this is in tandem with Horney's description of the detached-resigned as compulsively in need of solitude, being estranged from others, with a critical need for emotional distance and restriction of needs, forgoing all that engagement in the world brings.

The detached-resigned's desire to be free of desires and passions can be seen in Daly's desire that the Biophilic woman be free of what Daly calls the plastic and potted passions but which, in Horneyan terms, would be part of the lot of everyday life until the day we die: guilt, anxiety, depression, hostility, bitterness, resentment, boredom, resignation, and fulfillment. In keeping with the detached-resigned's preference for self-study, self-absorption and a life of intellectualizing, the Biophilic woman is to take as her primary task the discovery of her Final Causality, "the centralizing force/focus within the Self and within all be-ing."² This is accomplished by employing ludic cerebration or "clear reasoning rooted in deep intuition and verified by direct experience."³ Ludic cerebration as well as promoting a life lived in the intellect is a tool for self-sufficiency and disengagement from the input of everyday life.

Daly's Biophilic woman is identified with her idealized self. It is this cognitive minority that will be the liberators of humanity. They are categorically different from ordinary men and women, a separate species. Their identity and security is in Participation-in-Be-ing in the idealized magic circle Background with idealized Be-ing. Their thinking and knowing processes are categorically different from that of ordinary people, allowing them to operate in a magic circle of their own.

² Daly, *Pure Lust*, p. 154.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

The search for glory involves a compulsive search for perfection, a feeling that nothing is impossible, a magical belief in the power of one's own will, a sense that one's reasoning is infallible, one's foresight is flawless, one's knowledge is all encompassing. There is also the element of vindictive triumph. The idealized self of the Biophilic woman as presented above illustrates many of these characteristics. The Biophilic woman is a magical creature with reasoning, foresight, power of will and knowledge unavailable outside the cognitive minority.

In addition, the cognitive minority strive for vindictive triumph over the patriarchal male. In spite of the caveats warning that the descriptions of the patriarchal male are not philosophical descriptions of innate male being, the torrent of derogatory descriptors used for males in Daly's work from *Gyn/Ecology* forward are overwhelming and drown out these few statements regarding her purported philosophical intent. On the other hand, nowhere does Daly warn that she is not describing the innate being of non-patriarchal women when she presents the being of Biophilic women. Thus it seems necessary to assume in Daly's paradigm that the Biophilic woman is the authentic article. Biophilic women as presented by Daly have a very low opinion of patriarchal males and use every derogatory descriptor they can conjure and every occasion they can find to try to berate them into oblivion. "The Disassembly of Exorcism" that Daly presents at the end of *Gyn/Ecology* is a gathering of Biophilic women whose calling of patriarchal males to account annihilates these patriarchal males in the process; that is they self-destruct in the face of the scrutiny of Biophilic women.⁴ The attack continues even more vigorously in *Pure Lust* and *The Wickedary*. By page twenty-two in the former, Daly gives a chart of thirty-two descriptors from "bores" to "wantwits" with detailed explanations.⁵ In the latter, Daly dedicates "Word Web

⁴ Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, pp. 418-424.

⁵ Daly, *Pure Lust*, pp. 22-24.

Three,” a total of fifty-four pages, to derogatory descriptors of the patriarchal male and the world he creates and inhabits. There are no endearing characteristics in either of these lists. Therefore it would appear that the goal of Biophilic women as well as being existence in a magic circle place of their own beyond patriarchy that is inviolable and impenetrable, is the vindictive annihilation of the patriarchal male from whom she is endeavouring to escape.

The compulsive search for perfection, or the tyranny of the shoulds, is quite obvious in Daly's description of the Biophilic woman. She is definitely a woman who should do and not do certain things in order to become a member of the idealized cognitive minority. What follows is a brief survey of shoulds gleaned from *Gyn/Ecology* and *Pure Lust*.

The Biophilic woman should be Self-directing, in touch with her own voice, and intellectual. She must decode /unmask patriarchal language, myths, symbols, history, scholarship, assumptions, reversals, and gynocidal rituals. She should learn women's history, end male mentorship, and name patriarchy as the paradigm of all other evils. She must overcome the “Second Coming” of the “Witch Craze” by becoming a “Crazed Witch.” She must search out and claim feminist writers. She should be lucidly analytical, name and exorcize male obscenity, utter herself Utterly, judge women reformers as timid, affirm self's priorities, detect male fear of loving, be conscious of her own ‘Otherness,’ be attentive to ‘Real Presence,’ and discern between elemental passions and virtues and their plastic and potted substitutes.

Biophilic women should avoid: horizontal violence against all women, putting answers before questions, selling freedom for androcentric academic respectability, the assumptions of males that it has always been a man's world, selling out despite threats at all levels, thinking that one can obtain justice or equality within patriarchy, male processions, patriarchal saintliness,

robotitude, false harmony, revolutions, states of emergency, feminine fulfillment and self-sacrifice, appeasement, tidy answers, and male efforts to re-entrap them. Biophilic women should refuse the role of penitent/patient, seduction into tokenism, seduction into sado-sublimations, and restorations/rehabilitations.

iii) The Integrity of the Detached-Resigned Type

Horney believes that the detached-resigned solution allows for a partial and static integrity. Something of the real self is held onto tenaciously and protected vigorously. Daly comes closest to describing a way out of psychological pathology in her description of the Biophilic woman, that aspect of her paradigm that is intended to represent healthy human behaviour. The key difference between her description and Horney's description of the resolution of psychological pathology is that Daly's resolution is bound up in a seriously flawed paradigm of psychological health, that has more in common with Horney's description of the psychologically flawed detached-resigned solution.

Early in Daly's work there was talk of "confrontation, dialogue, a co-operation between the sexes undreamed of in the past...,"⁶ a "tolerance for ambiguity," and a realization that there are no absolute answers because there is no ultimate authority.⁷ And finally a self-actualizing diarchy in which men and women would be participants in an androgenous humanity.⁸ In this pre *Gyn'Ecology* period women are urged to name things for themselves, to express rage creatively, to attend to one another, to move out of masochistic self-alienation, to be bold and courageous,

⁶ Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, p. 195.

⁷ Daly, "Return of the Protestant Principle," p. 339.

⁸ See Chapter Two, footnote 141.

spontaneous and self-accepting, open and autonomous with a democratic character. Daly encouraged women to abandon the false patriarchal self and to withdraw from the oppression of patriarchy into a biophilic space that was to be neither absolute nor an escape. There was even to be love for the oppressor and a refusal to victimize him: "To love the oppressor does not mean to submit, but to affirm yourself and therefore make the oppressor see himself realistically."⁹; and "To settle for reducing 'the Other' to victim status would be a failure."¹⁰ With *Gyn/Ecology* and thereafter there is a dramatic shift away from working for any kind of relationship with the male oppressor and the equally dramatic birth of the Biophilic woman. Daly calls for a consciousness of women's situation and a clear analysis of it. She too desires the Biophilic woman to find her real-Original Self and to be aware of how easily that connection can be lost without due vigilance. These are all directions that Horney's theory of the resolution of pathology embraces. Horney calls for a detailed analysis, a keen awareness, a willingness to see things as they are. But Horney also calls for a willingness to take one's share of the blame, and a willingness to face one's arrogating of privileges, responsibilities and personal characteristics and capacities to oneself that belong to all, as well as facing the discarding of those privileges, responsibilities, characteristics and capacities that belong to all but that one is unwilling to bear. And for Horney there is no one absolutely evil or absolutely good. Pathology is a matter of degree of dysfunction and a function of how compulsive one's choices are and how unconscious the conflicts are. And pathology is gender blind, though Horney notes that in American culture women seem more inclined to be compliant-morbidly dependent and men more inclined to be aggressive-vindictive. Daly's intuition of what must be done to move away from a pathological mode of behaviour is stymied

⁹ Daly, "The Church and Women," p. 352.

¹⁰ Daly, "The Spiritual Revolution," p. 174.

by the static nature of the Biophilic woman herself. Her belief that she is super humanly good and conscious and knowing and able to act disables the possibility of growth. She and the detached-resigned are in this conundrum because they both believe they do not need to grow out their present situation, a situation that requires guarding their integrity. The cost of abandoning this posture for both is the loss of the real-Original Self.

b) Further Aspects of the Magic Circle

A few aspects of the detached-resigned type not dealt with in describing various aspects of the magic circle are nonetheless integral parts of it. Horney speaks of a numbness to emotional experiences. The last thing one would accuse Daly of is describing the Biophilic woman as numb emotionally. The catch is that the Biophilic woman operates in a static environment cut off from everyday life. Daly can use every vigorous emotional expression in the English language, and I think she does, but it still does not change the container in which those descriptors are supposed to be active: the magic circle Background. To be cut off from everyday life would require an emotional numbness and perhaps this is best represented in Daly's work in her failure to consider the relationship between women and their children, to say nothing of her failure to address the relationship of women and men in the everyday world. This failure becomes quite obvious with the writing of *Gyn/Ecology* and with what Daly writes thereafter.

The detached-resigned avoids the structures of everyday life as does Daly's Biophilic woman. These structures interfere with the freedom from everyday life, and the freedom for magic-circle life.

And what if the magic circle were shattered? What if the unchangeable mould into which Daly has cast patriarchal men and Biophilic women comes undone because the dynamics of such static stereotypes usually have a limited “shelf life” thanks to continuous social upheavals? Or what if it is undone by a relentless search for health in which all are more willing to take their share of the blame and work more wholeheartedly for an improved everyday life? Daly warns Biophilic women not to become re-entrapped into the patriarchal sadosociety of everyday life. Should that happen they will lose their Selves. Yet when one emerges from the magic circle one can only lose a false self, an arrogated self, a pathological self.

Biophilic women are obliged to cherish unchangeability, as all detached-resigned neurotic types do. In order to remain in the magic circle Background they cannot disavow their absolute goodness. No amount of Dalyan rhetoric about metamorphosis can counter the reality that no real change is required in the Background. When one's conflicts are put out of commission by withdrawing from them into a magic circle, there is no necessity for change. The static status quo of Participation -in- Be-ing is all that is required. Horney notes that the detached-resigned type is very taken up with being as opposed to growing. It is a static being in an unchanging environment.

4.4 The Resolution of the Meshing and Clashing of Paradigms

I have pointed out the ways in which Daly's paradigm meshes and clashes with Horney's. Daly's patriarchal male and Horney's aggressive-vindictive neurotic type have much in common, except for the fact that Daly falls short in presenting the ambivalence and ambiguity that Horney finds this type to exhibit. Daly's patriarchal woman and Horney's compliant-morbidly dependent

type also have much in common, but Daly's principal failure here, from an Horneyan view point, is in not ascribing any ultimate responsibility to the patriarchal woman for the ongoing pathological state. With Daly's Biophilic woman the paradigms clash. What Daly describes as healthy is very akin to what Horney finds neurotic in her detached-resigned type. Whereas there are some hints from Daly as to what a healthy person and a healthy course of action might be, they are indistinguishably entwined in an aspect of her paradigm that describes a psychologically pathological type.

Totally despicable necrophilic males who are responsible for the state of their equally pathological if not accountable female counterparts, and totally good Biophilic women do not correspond to men and women in everyday life. In comparison to Horney, Daly is quite lopsided, quite prejudiced, not quite in this everyday world. Whereas Horney was quite aware of the privileged position of men in the world in which she lived and how they organized things to suit themselves and that women needed to learn to act in their own best interests in the face of this, the political observations did not significantly colour her theory of human behaviour. For her both men and women can be aggressive-vindictive, compliant-morbidly dependent and detached-resigned. I believe that she could have this open approach toward pathology and its spread among the population because she believed the root of that pathology to be self-hate: the refusal to be one's real, limited yet spontaneous self in the everyday world. This refusal requires the creation of a false self that eventually becomes idealized and tyrannized and tyrannizing, especially in the aggressive-vindictive and the compliant-morbidly dependent types. Daly, on the other hand places her political conclusion that men hate women at the core of her paradigm. I believe that this political belief causes her to construct the patriarchal men and women and the Biophilic

women of her paradigm in such a way that they reflect this belief. Men who hate women are thoroughly hateful and thoroughly responsible for their hatred - there are no mitigating circumstances. The women who are allied with them are totally under the sway of this hatred which is life threatening in every way. But Daly constructs women as not responsible for their paralysis because the hatred of men controls them. Biophilic women on the other hand are constructed as another species altogether who inhabit a different cosmos beyond the realm of male hatred. Everything in Daly's paradigm revolves around her belief in misogyny as the root of patriarchal pathology. Everything in Horney's paradigm revolves around her belief in the refusal to be oneself as the root of pathology. Daly presents us with a psychological paradigm of three false selves, rather than the one false self of the patriarchal woman and the two 'real' selves of the patriarchal male and the Biophilic female that she purports to present the reader. Horney presents us with a paradigm of three false selves that she sees as false selves, and a road map to move beyond these pathological positions to one of health. Horney believes that taking one's share of the blame, compassion, and wholeheartedness are central to psychological health. Nowhere in Daly's paradigm is there a suggestion that women, patriarchal or Biophilic take their share of the blame. Nowhere in Daly's paradigm, which takes its final form in *Gyn/Ecology* and the writings that follow, is there compassion for the patriarchal male. It could be argued that her suggested compassion for the patriarchal female is patronizing. Nowhere in Daly's paradigm is there genuine wholeheartedness, a capacity "to be without pretense, to be emotionally sincere, to be able to put the whole of oneself into one's feelings, one's work, one's beliefs. It can only be approximated to the extent that conflicts are resolved."¹¹ Wholeheartedness is not possible, in

¹¹ Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts*, p. 242.

Horney's theory, to false selves who inhabit an idealized world. Daly's paradigm is forever spinning, going nowhere, its Archimedean point a false conclusion about the root of pathology. Horney's paradigm describes the problem created by the refusal to be our everyday real selves, maps out a possible solution, and suggests reasonable and humane goals. There is no Archimedean point in Horney's theory; the situation differs from person to person, and is complex she acknowledges beyond her capacity to present more than the general shape of. Daly's paradigm fails both to demonstrate that misogyny is a plausible root for patriarchal pathology and that Biophilic women are its solution. Horney's paradigm suggests both a plausible cause for and a plausible way out of the psychological difficulties between the sexes.

Whereas Daly's psychological paradigm is meshed into her philosophical and political analysis of patriarchy and suffers from the entanglement, Horney's is a sustained psychological paradigm whose sole purpose is to understand human psychology. As such it is an excellent mechanism not only to assess and evaluate Daly's psychological paradigm, but also to further the work Daly is endeavouring to do.

CHAPTER FIVE: REFLECTION AND CONCLUSION

I would like to reflect upon the kind of support there is among scholars who comment on the work of Mary Daly for my contention that Daly's psychological paradigm is inadequate in comparison to Karen Horney's in both the description of psychological pathology and health and psychological pathology's root cause. I conclude by exhorting scholars to consider the potential of Karen Horney's work to improve understanding of the conflicts between the sexes.

A review of secondary source material around the concerns of this thesis reveal a great concern with Mary Daly's ontology and her choice of sexism¹ with its concomitant misogyny as the root paradigm of patriarchal evil. Related concerns focus on Daly's creation of the Background and the Biophilic woman's Journey to this space. There is some concern with her ethical formulation and a lot of concern with what is perceived to be her dismissal of the views of others. In the first section of this part, I consider the work of those who are in any way supportive of Daly's ontology with its related questions of the Background, the Journey to the Background, and her ethical formulation for the Biophilic woman. The second section will review the work of those who disagree in varying degrees with Daly on these topics, and their additional concerns about Daly's choice of sexism as the root of patriarchal evil and her dismissal of the views of others. The sources go as far back as the early 1970's and reach as far forward as the early 1990's.

¹Daly uses sexism and misogyny interchangeably: sexism for her is the hatred of women. Other writers who comment on her work are more inclined to use the word sexism only. It seems to me that how much that term includes an understanding that sexism involves the hatred of women, and the extent of that hatred, varies from writer to writer.

In each case I address the critique to the themes outlined above. These themes are couched in the language Daly uses. Most authors do not use Daly's language when they are critiquing her work. For example, although the "Biophilic woman" is being critiqued directly or indirectly, most women simply critique Daly's description of "women." I use Biophilic woman, along with patriarchal male and patriarchal female or patriarchal women for a sense of consistency and coherence.

5.1 Supportive Critique

There are a few writers who do not believe that Daly has villainized males. Sarah Darter believes that Daly sees sexism, not white males as the enemy of women.² Josephine Payne-O'Connor declares that Daly is not "a man-hating, child-hating, feminine separatist..."³ Rather, Daly has withdrawn from the battle of the sexes and has simply left men to fend for themselves.

There are a few more writers who believe that Daly has accurately described, at least in some small way, healthy women when she writes of Biophilic women. Carter Heyward gives some qualified support for Daly's description of the Biophilic woman as fundamentally creative, needing time to be alone and time to be with other women, and having the courage to name and to rage, even if this woman does not live these realities in the patriarchal world.⁴ Ruth Evans, commenting on Daly's penchant for psychological analysis, writes that "Daly...writes with the deepest perception and conviction...that the basic step in overcoming her alienation is for a

² Sarah L. Darter, response to "Does Feminist Theology Liberate?" by McLeod Bryan, *Foundations*, 19 (1976), pp. 50-52.

³ Josephine Payne-O'Connor, response to the review of *Gyn/Ecology: Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, by Ross Kraemer, *Signs* 6, 2 (1980), pp. 340-342.

⁴ Carter Heyward, "Speaking and Sparking, Building and Burning," *Christianity and Crisis*, 39, 5 (1979), pp. 66-72.

woman to recover an autonomous sense of self.”⁵ For Payne-O’Connor the Biophilic woman is simply matching the male power of deceit with her “power of vision and derision.”⁶ Carlyn Mouton supports unequivocally Daly’s creation of the Biophilic woman. These women are wild women living in the transcendent now. They are not responsible for saving the patriarchal world created by men. They are only accidentally related to the necrophilic patriarchal males. Biophilic women are innately different from patriarchal women and men. Part of what makes Biophilic women different are their conscious choices.⁷ Finally, Paula Hirshboeck believes that Daly has a postmodern vision of the Biophilic self of women which, contrary to much of the negative critique, Hirshboeck believes, is not essentialist. Rather this self is a self in process, a self that is radically and individually connected, a self that is constantly changing.⁸

Critique of Daly’s description of the healthy Background home of Biophilic women is about equally supportive and unsupportive. June O’Connor sees the bonding in Sisterhood as positive, the renouncing of the patriarchal god, rape, genocide, and war as necessary, and the leap of evolution in women’s becoming as hopeful.⁹ Casey Miller and Kate Smith favour Daly’s prioritizing of women’s experience.¹⁰ Wanda Berry believes that Daly has a Jungian imagination that leads her to picture healing as a movement from loss of communication within the divided self to discovery of the lost self. Recovery leads to harmony and mutuality. Daly’s individualism is

⁵ Ruth Evans. “Woman as Other: A Study of Alienation in Rosemary Ruether, Mary Daly and Sheila Collins” (masters thesis, St. Michael’s College, 1980), p. 112.

⁶ Josephine Payne-O’Connor, p. 341.

⁷ Carlyn Mouton, “Spooking the Snools: Scriptures According to Daly,” *Broadside*, 6, 3 (1995), pp. 10-11.

⁸ Paula Hirschboeck, “Soul Making Women: A Philosophical Exploration of Imaginal Feminisms” (Ph.D. diss., Union Institute, 1992), pp. 120, 135 ff.

⁹ June O’Connor, “Liberation Theologies and the Women’s Movement: Points of Comparison and Contrast,” *Horizons* 2, (1975), pp. 108-120.

¹⁰ Casey Miller and Kate Smith, “Women and the Language of Religion,” *The Christian Century* 93, (1976), pp. 353-358.

balanced by the communal and ecological accord accomplished by the cosmic covenant.¹¹ Vicky Cosstick thinks the Background is a valuable “time/space” that Daly has created for women, enabling them to withdraw their energies from patriarchy.¹² Payne-O’Connor doesn’t believe that Daly intends separatism because it is obvious that women can’t leave the patriarchal universe. Payne-O’Connor appears to believe that the same is obvious for Daly.¹³ Carlyn Mouton believes, with Daly, that separatism from the cause of separatism is needed to end the social contract that is patriarchy.¹⁴ Susan Thistlethwaite concludes that Daly’s description of the Background “gives a profound glimpse into what it would mean to actually live in the physical world and in the imagination, and not abandon the physical world for abstractionist human consciousness.”¹⁵ Nancy Howell, like Mouton, believes unequivocally in the need for women’s separatism in the Background. Women need to invest their energy in themselves: the male question is a non question. Women regain their lost energy, they are removed from the source of alienation, they are able to pare away the false selves from the Self and remove internal and external barriers to reaching Selfhood. The choice for the Background is a choice for mental health, a stand against the pseudo reality of patriarchy.¹⁶ Sarah Hoagland has a similar perspective: the separatist choice is both a mentally healthy choice and an effective ethical and political choice.¹⁷ Daphne Hampson also supports Daly’s separatist stance, because it is visionary, something necessary to create

¹¹ Wanda Warren Berry, “Images of Sin and Salvation in Feminist Theology,” *Anglican Theological Review* 60, 1 (1978), pp. 24-54.

¹² Vicky Cosstick, “Meet Mary Daly, Feminist Philosopher,” *Kinesis* (April/May 1979), pp. 3-4.

¹³ Josephine Payne-O’Connor, pp. 341-342.

¹⁴ Carlyn Mouton, p. 11.

¹⁵ Susan B. Thistlethwaite, “God and Her Survival in a Nuclear Age,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 4, (1988), pp. 83-84.

¹⁶ Nancy R. Howell, “Radical Relatedness and Feminist Separatism,” *Process Studies* 18, (1989), pp. 119-124.

¹⁷ Sarah Lucia Hoagland, *Lesbian Ethics* (Palo Alto: Institute of Lesbian Studies, 1983), p. 61. This text is an excellent one to read alongside Daly’s work. In many ways it is a parallel presentation with the advantage of being

something new in the world. She writes, "One may ask after the relevance of separatism: it is an apt question. Perhaps the relevance lies in the fact that some women are prepared to go to these lengths, often sacrificing comfort and incurring social ridicule, in order to keep a light burning."¹⁸

There are a few supportive voices for Daly's Journey to the Background. Marjorie Suchocki gives some qualified support. She finds the Journey metaphor to be a good inward to outward model - but for transformation of Christianity within patriarchy. Suchocki believes that a truly self-centred woman can operate anywhere.¹⁹ For Rosemary Ruether Daly's Journey metaphor is important because it stresses the necessity of women making the painful journey into consciousness of sexism.²⁰

Marilyn Frye is supportive of Daly's ethical understanding of how plastic and potted passions entrap the patriarchal woman. Frye believes Daly's study of the plastic and potted passions in *Gyn/Ecology* is the most powerful part of the book, enabling her to better understand "the experience of white feminists who are caught up in an endless pseudo-struggle...around racism."²¹

very readable. It is a closely reasoned argument for Daly's Background without Daly's flamboyant rhetoric. For Hoagland separation is a form of engagement with and within patriarchy.

¹⁸ Daphne Hampson, *Theology and Feminism* (Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990), p. 143.

¹⁹ Marjorie Suchocki, pp. 314-315.

²⁰ Rosemary Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1980), p. 187.

²¹ Marilyn Frye, "Famous Lust Words," *The Women's Review of Books* 1, 11 (1984), p. 4.

5.2 Negative Critique

Mary Daly's work has been criticized for its ontological conclusions about male and female being. There are those who believe that her choice of misogyny as the root paradigm for the political and psychological evils of patriarchy is misguided.

In reviewing the themes that emerged from the secondary source material I found it interesting how they lined up with aspects of Horney's theory. The villainized male is the despised self; the Biophilic woman is the idealized self; the Background is the magic circle; the Journey is the escape to the magic circle; the ethical shoulds are the tyranny of the shoulds. The dismissal of the views of others is an aggressive-vindictive strategy for putting conflicts out of action. Citing hatred of women as the sole cause of the problem between the sexes can also be considered a strategy for putting conflicts out of action through failure to take one's share of the blame.

Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza is concerned that Daly's ontological approach is depersonalizing. She believes that reversing categories is not enough because the categories are still sex-typed, and therefore fail to overcome the dichotomy of sex-role stereotyping. Fiorenza is concerned that Daly is unable to do without what she accuses men of: scapegoating, castrating, and making another the "other."²² In a later observation, Fiorenza notes that Daly's tendency to universalize does not allow for the ambiguity of everyday life. She also believes that Daly presents patriarchal women as non-beings separate from the ideologically pure Biophilic women, a distinction that she believes causes an unnecessary dichotomy among women.²³ William Phipps

²² Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Why Not a Category of Friend/Friendship?" *Horizons* 2 (1975), pp. 117-118.

²³ Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 24-26.

has difficulty with those like Daly who merely reverse the androcentric view. He finds both the androcentric and the gynocentric views myopic: "Both views are as myopic as the views of those who think that our sun and its planets are at the hub of the world. Neither male nor female, neither sun nor earth has ultimate primacy. There is a mutuality between the sexes..."²⁴ G. McLeod Bryan, like Fiorenza, is concerned with Daly's penchant for reversals. He finds her theology strident and one-sided, making an absolute enemy of the male, with the male as scapegoat in her reversed androcentrism. He notes that there are male faults but no female faults. He finds Daly's approach to men very punishing.²⁵ Carol Christ believes that Daly has both reified sexual differences and rigidly polarized the hierarchical and dualistic thinking of patriarchy.²⁶ Carter Heyward sees in Daly "an apparent contempt for men and for women whom she does not consider to be Amazing Amazons."²⁷ Ross Kraemer finds Daly's view of the male, monolithic and homogenizing, a mere reversal of what patriarchy does to women.²⁸ Rita Gross objects to Daly's ontology of the male: "Daly also seems to intimate that maleness, *per se*, is so radically deficient that it is a completely unworkable condition."²⁹ Rosemary Ruether, in a similar vein, comments that "The pattern of Daly's thought moves increasingly toward a concept of the male as generically evil and thus necessarily generating evil structures. The atmosphere of Daly's thought is a kind of other-worldly incantation by which one demystifies and escapes out of the existing demonic male world."³⁰ Midge Quant, like Fiorenza, comments on the dichotomy Daly

²⁴ William E. Phipps, "Adam's Rib: Bone of Contention," *Theology Today* 33 (1967), p. 273.

²⁵ G. McLeod Bryan, "Does Feminist Theology Liberate?" *Foundations* 19 (1976), pp. 40-49.

²⁶ Carol P. Christ, "The New Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature," *Religious Studies Review* 3, 4 (1977), pp. 203-206.

²⁷ Heyward, p. 69.

²⁸ Ross S. Kraemer, review of *Gyn/Ecology*, by Mary Daly, *Signs*, (1979), p.356.

²⁹ Rita M. Gross, "Bitterness and Effectiveness: Reflections on Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*," *Anima* 7 (1980), p. 49.

³⁰ Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983), p. 284.

creates between patriarchal and Biophilic women. She objects to Daly's conclusions that patriarchal women are diseased and conditioned to execute phallocratic crimes and that "all men are life-hating and evil..."³¹ She also decries as illogical Daly's insistence that patriarchal women are robots and yet responsible for their robotitude. In general, Daly's pessimism leaves little hope for change. Vivian Harrower also notes the dichotomies in Daly, and she describes them as necrophilic. She writes, "Yet even as [Daly] is objecting to the feminine being defined and stereotyped by men, Daly appears to be insisting that men act in a stereotyped 'masculine' manner rather than seeking a new way of relating to women."³² She wonders if Daly is "merely reversing the old order by the same kind of projection she has accused males of using."³³ Harrower is skeptical about the male exclusion from biophilic life. She is also concerned, along with others, that there appears not to be a place for ordinary women in Daly's vision.³⁴ Andrea Nye, like Quant, questions what room for change is created in Daly's view of women as victims and men as innately violent.³⁵ Sheila Davaney believes Daly's essentially necrophilic male residing outside of the epistemologically privileged position of Biophilic women is philosophically, historically, and socially indefensible.³⁶

There is extensive critique of Daly's description of the Biophilic woman. June O'Connor is perturbed by Daly's reluctance "to place any blame on women for the oppression that

³¹ Midge Quant, "Mary Daly's Latest Philosophical Quest," *New Directions For Women* (September/October 1984), p. 14.

³² Vivian Jarrett Harrower, "Feminist Critiques of a Male Savior: Christology in the Writings of Mary Daly and Rosemary Ruether" (master's thesis, St. Michael's College, 1985), p. 23.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³⁵ Andrea Nye, *Feminist Theory and the Philosophies of Man* (New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 99 ff.

³⁶ Sheila Davaney, "The Limits of the Appeal to Women's Experience," in *Shaping New Vision: Gender and Value in American Culture*, eds. Clarissa W. Atkinson, Constance H. Buchanan, Margaret Miles (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987), pp. 31-49.

subjugates them.”³⁷ Christine Allen’s comments about Mary Daly’s approach to her task could also be construed to be a comment on Daly’s Biophilic woman. Allen believes Daly is mistaken in placing her whole confidence in her own intuition without consulting external referents; her Biophilic woman appears to make the same mistake. She also perceives an exaltation of self-love in Daly’s work that I think could also be applied to Daly’s Biophilic woman.³⁸ Michael Berenbaum thinks Daly’s exaltation of Biophilic women to the position of world conscience merely invites more hatred for them. He also has trouble with a conceptualization of suffering that leads to self-righteousness and an implied superiority.³⁹ On a similar note, G. McLeod Bryan accuses Daly of remaking God in the victim’s image, with God being the champion of Daly’s messianic, history-bearing Biophilic women. Whereas men are consigned to hell, Daly’s Biophilic woman is idealized and heroicized as a kind of superwoman.⁴⁰ In a similar vein, Wanda Berry believes that Daly’s work needs atonement images to enable her women to acknowledge their share of the blame for the evils of patriarchy.⁴¹ Paul Tong, like Bryan, is troubled by Daly’s idealizing of Biophilic women. He sees their Participation-in-Be-ing as “a suprasexual existence of self-independence, self-sufficiency, and self-integral unity.”⁴² This self-transcendence is basically perilous because it is a negation of the everyday self. And whereas Carl Raschke believes that God the Father is rightly declared dead, he disagrees with Daly’s belief in the glorified Biophilic

³⁷ O’Connor, p. 112.

³⁸ Christine Allen, “Self-Creation and Loss of Self: Mary Daly and St. Teresa of Avila,” *Religious Studies* 6, 1 (1976), pp. 67-72.

³⁹ Michael Berenbaum, “Women, Blacks, and Jews: Theologians of Survival,” *Religion and Life* 45 (1976), p. 10 ff.

⁴⁰ Bryan, p. 45 ff.

⁴¹ Berry, p. 51.

⁴² Paul K.K. Tong, “The Sex of God: a Critique of Mary Daly’s Transcendental Theology For Women’s Liberation,” in *God, Sex and the Social Project*, ed. J.H. Grace (Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1978), p. 41.

woman independent of the male as the new being that will arise out of that death.⁴³ Carter Heyward's concern about Daly's epistemology is in a similar vein to Tong's concern about Daly's self-transcendence. Heyward describes Daly's epistemology as one that places all knowledge in the mind of the knower who has autonomous reason and sense of perception. This raises the question for Heyward as to whether Daly's Biophilic woman is merely a state of mind living outside of and above patriarchy. On a somewhat different note, Ross Kraemer finds Daly's Biophilic women to have a Gnostic quality, divine souls embedded in material bodies controlled by material and evil men who prevent them from returning to their heavenly realm of light: the Background. However, as noted by Heyward, Kraemer points out that Daly's Biophilic souls have true knowledge on their side and thus are expected to win out in the end.⁴⁴

Rita Gross finds Daly's vision of Biophilic women and necrophilic men to be quite impractical, given the existence of men, and that separation from them would be unhelpful for women in the long run.⁴⁵ Barbara Andolsen is offended by Daly's glossing over of women's capacity for evil especially as seen in White women's collusion in the evils perpetrated against Blacks. She believes Daly to be "naïve when she portrays women as morally superior beings who intrinsically possess creative values superior to any values previously articulated by men."⁴⁶ From a theological standpoint, Mary Ann Stenger accuses Daly of identifying the Biophilic woman's experience, at times, with that of the Ultimate and that she thus does not discuss the ambiguity and ambivalence within woman's experience. "To affirm any finite movement as so good, so true,

⁴³ Carl Raschke, "The Death of God the Father," *Iliff Review* 35 (1978), p. 63.

⁴⁴ Kraemer, pp. 354-356.

⁴⁵ Gross, p.50.

⁴⁶ Barbara Hilkert Andolsen, "Racism in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Women's Movements: An Ethical Appraisal" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt College, 1981), p. 293.

so revelatory, and so ultimate is to come close to idolizing it...good ideas lose significance because the claims for feminism are so great and so extreme. Daly's analysis is also inadequate because she seems to limit the manifestation of the ultimate to feminist experience."⁴⁷

Rosemary Ruether believes that Daly's approach could cause women to fall into the trap of "reversed female chauvinism that could cause one to lose touch with the human face of males and begin to imagine that women alone are human and males are evil and defective."⁴⁸ Susan Everson describes Daly's Biophilic woman as disembodied, "without connection to the social context."⁴⁹ Everson goes on to speculate that Daly further wants women to escape history as well as the body: "by defining patriarchal culture as evil, and implying that all women associated with it are unenlightened and victimized, she creates an exclusive vision of the association of the elect, liberated selves and essentially abandons all who haven't arrived."⁵⁰ Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza also sees Daly as someone who prefers to be outside history, and whose vision is one of "disembodied souls." She writes, "Daly's bonding of the feminist 'elect and holy' is rather a disembodied and dehistoricized vision that reminds me of the neo-Platonic Catholic hope for the communion of disembodied souls."⁵¹ Kathleen Martindale is also concerned about the disembodied nature of Daly's Biophilic women since their happiness seems more likely to exclude their sexuality than to include it.⁵² Vivian Harrower wonders whether Daly's women can be weak

⁴⁷ Mary Ann Stenger, "A Critical Analysis of the Influence of Paul Tillich on Mary Daly's Feminist Theology," *Encounter* 43, 3 (1982), p. 234. Stenger reiterates this position in "Male Over Female or Female Over Male: A Critique of Idolatry," *Soundings*, 69, pp. 473-474.

⁴⁸ Ruether, p. 188.

⁴⁹ Susan Everson, "Bodyself: Women's Bodily Experience in Recent Feminist Theology and Women's Literature" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1984), p. 122.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁵¹ Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, pp. 24-28.

⁵² Kathleen Martindale, review of *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy* by Mary Daly, *RFR/DRF* 13, 3 (1984), p. 55.

and vulnerable: "A question arises as to whether the movement of women as Daly sees it can allow for weakness or vulnerability among its members."⁵³ Marsha Hewitt believes that Daly reifies women such that they are not recognizable in everyday life. This contributes nothing to women's learning how to participate more effectively on their own behalf in the real historical world. She also believes that Daly re-imprisons women conceptually: "Daly's glorification of female attributes and values mobilizes identity thinking within the walls of rigid conceptualisations that foreclose on the mystery of individual being in all its diversity and difference."⁵⁴ It all adds up to Daly's merely reversing the patriarchal glorification of the male. Flora Keshgegian comments that Daly's emphasis on either the horrific or the euphoric does not allow for the psychological space women need to mourn. She is also concerned that Daly's prescription for Biophilic women requires them to split themselves off from their former selves and from their past.⁵⁵ Finally, Jean Grimshaw sees the Biophilic woman as an essentialist, humanist self. She summarizes her conclusions as follows:

1. An essential or original female self which is wholly autonomous and is sharply contrasted with women who are 'man-made' or 'brainwashed' by patriarchal ideology.
2. A conception of this self which sees it as potentially unitary, non-contradictory, and wholly perspicuous to itself; and which sees psychic knots, tangles, barriers, obstacles and splits as the result of the *invasion* of this self, both physical and psychic, by forces which are alien to it.⁵⁶

⁵³ Harrower, p. 26.

⁵⁴ Marsha Aileen Hewitt, *Critical Theory of Religion: A Feminist Analysis* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), p. 199. Cf. pages 139, 143, 210.

⁵⁵ Flora Angel Keshgegian, *To Know By Heart: Towards a Theology of Remembering for Salvation* (Boston College, University Microfilms, 1992), pp. 247-248.

⁵⁶ Jean Grimshaw, "Pure Lust: The Elemental Feminist Philosophy of Mary Daly," *Radical Philosophy* 49 (1988), p. 24.

Grimshaw believes that elements of humanist philosophy have coloured Daly's perception, such as the view that human nature is perfectible given a suitable environment, and in Daly's privileging the rational, self-determining person at the expense of the sensual, sexual human being.

Grimshaw notes that Daly is "scornful of most 'feminine' desires."⁵⁷ and dismissive of negative emotions like guilt, anxiety, depression, hostility, bitterness, resentment, boredom, and resignation that do not have objects outside the self. She believes that Daly's Biophilic women have little to do with real, historic women.

Daly's Background space receives about as many nays as yeas. Berenbaum worries that Daly's Background which he describes as an extremely lesbian community, creates a re-entry problem into everyday life and leaves little hope for eventual reintegration of Biophilic women with the rest of society.⁵⁸ Carol Christ does not believe that Daly's Biophilic Sisterhood is a valid bearer of messianic consciousness because Daly has reified the sexual differences between men and women and she has rigidly polarized the hierarchical and dualistic thinking of patriarchy.⁵⁹ Rita Gross who sees Daly's vision of Biophilic women and necrophilic men as inaccurate and impractical concludes "that the much more radically feminist concern seems to be living in the general, larger community in a woman-identified fashion with dignity and independence."⁶⁰ Vicky Cosstick notes in her interview with Daly that she seems imprisoned in her own new language and that Daly comments that she despises economics. By extension we might conclude that Biophilic women might also be imprisoned in their gynocentric language and a failure to deal with the

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 25.

⁵⁸ Berenbaum, p. 116.

⁵⁹ Christ, pp. 205-206.

⁶⁰ Gross, p. 50.

pressing economic realities of the everyday world.⁶¹ In a similar vein, Ruth Evans notes in her evaluation of Daly's work that there are few references to economics which she sees as further evidence of Daly's idealist posture.⁶² Hester Eisenstein believes that Daly's separatist Background is a retreat to a safe haven.⁶³ Vivian Harrower fails to find convincing Daly's assumption that women's communities would be free of oppression.⁶⁴ Andrea Nye sees Daly as a visionary in a spiritual circle of women which is neither socially or economically possible outside of patriarchy. She believes that Daly has a magical expectation of protection in her utopian portrayal of a separatist community, and she wonders, even if such a community could be formed, how it could escape power politics.⁶⁵

Beverly Wildung Harrison has a great deal to say about Daly's separatist, Background space. She writes,

At times I wish I believed, with Daly, that the power of patriarchy could be overthrown if only we women would absent ourselves from patriarchal processions altogether. If only the *withholding* of power were adequate to bring about social change in our world, undoing oppression would not be difficult. However, we women should be the last to allow ourselves to be trapped in a 'spiritualizing' notion that real change in our flesh and body world ever comes from absenting ourselves from what is going on in that world.⁶⁶

Harrison finds Daly's language otherworldly, world denying, and escapist.⁶⁷ For Harrison, "Doing" must be as fundamental as "Be-ing."⁶⁸ Jane Hedley brings us back to the language question

⁶¹ Cosstick, p. 4.

⁶² Evans, p. 114.

⁶³ Carol Anne Douglas, review of "Contemporary Feminist Thought" by Hester Eisenstein, *Off Our Backs* (1984), p. 21.

⁶⁴ Harrower, p. 33.

⁶⁵ Nye, pp. 101-102.

⁶⁶ Harrison, "The Power of Anger in the Work of Love: Christian Ethics for Women and Other Strangers," in *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, edited by Ann Loades, 197. London: SPCK, 1990.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

that Vicky Cosstick raises. Hedley's most telling criticism is about how Daly uses language to create an illusory world. She notes that Meaghan Morris had already observed in the early 1980's that Daly was using language to, in Hedley's words, "create a self-enclosed speech community of the elect."⁶⁹ Hedley states further that Daly uses language as incantation to both reject patriarchy and to create a world other than it. She believes that Daly works very hard to foster the ahistorical illusion that words "possess their meanings intrinsically - that they have an inherent power of their own."⁷⁰ Hedley concludes that "The women's community whose Naming process Daly champions in the *Wickedary* is an abstraction - not the agent but the figment of its prophetic exhortations."⁷¹ Marsha Hewitt chafes at Daly's exclusivist vision, that excludes all men and most women, and in which the membership is decided by Daly alone. She concludes: "What Daly proposes...is little more than a form of romantic escapism by driving women's revolutionary energy for social and personal transformation into esoteric realms of privatized experience."⁷² Further, "Daly prefers a more privatized and individualistic approach that promotes personal flamboyancy and outrageousness than public, issues-oriented struggle."⁷³ Flora Keshgegian describes Daly's Background as mystical, a place where Daly does not attend to the realities of the suffering caused by women's victimization in the real world.⁷⁴ Daly's dualistic epistemology of the real as good, and the false as evil gives us good women in the Background and evil men in the patriarchal world. Because this epistemology is not grounded in the real, everyday world, the

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 202.

⁶⁹ Jane Hedley, "Surviving to Speak New Language: Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich," *Hypatia* (Spring 1992), p. 47.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 49.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 50.

⁷² Marsha Hewitt, p. 139.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 181.

⁷⁴ Keshgegian, p. 249.

oppressive patriarchal structures are left untouched.⁷⁵ Keshgegian is not impressed with Daly's elitist community of the cognitive few. "It is populated only by those who share Daly's vision and, increasingly, by those who use her language. Thus the community of discourse of which Daly is a member is a relatively small circle of women."⁷⁶ With Hewitt, Keshgegian concludes that Daly abandons the struggle of living in the everyday world.⁷⁷

If the Background is a place of escape in the eyes of many of Daly's critics, the Journey is the escape route. Carter Heyward describes Daly as "'spinning' off into her own space of female idolatry and isolation..."⁷⁸ She sees Daly as someone who burns bridges, traumatizes and pulls life lines in, and then "flees inward, for a personal exorcism of the mind."⁷⁹ Rita Gross believes Daly's Journey and by implication that of Biophilic women is stuck in the rage stage.⁸⁰ Susan Everson concludes that Daly's portrayal of women "as totally victimized underdogs" who battle against the patriarchal oppressor makes her Journey "a male mythical quest journey" more than a journey of women's lived experience.⁸¹ Marsha Hewitt finds Daly's presentation of the Journey wanting in practical detail. "Daly hardly addresses the question of the context of women's journey toward authenticity; where does it take place, in history or in some other realm to which only women have access?"⁸²

Only Bryan and Grimshaw comment directly on Daly's ethical posture. Bryan understands Daly's ethic to be heroic in nature, reserved for the few, excluding all men and most women.⁸³

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 251.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 255.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 258.

⁷⁸ Heyward, p. 72.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 71.

⁸⁰ Gross, p.51.

⁸¹ Everson, pp. 124-126.

⁸² Hewitt, p. 138.

⁸³ Bryan, p. 48.

Grimshaw, as reported above, finds Daly “scornful of most ‘feminine’ desires” and dismissive of the everyday negative emotions that often do not have a clearly defined object outside the self. Biophilic women should be above guilt, anxiety, depression, hostility, bitterness, resentment, boredom, and resignation.

There are several who are concerned about what they perceive to be Daly’s effort to preempt the views of others, or in Horneyan language to put and keep conflicts out of action. By extension this trait would appear to belong to those traits associated with Biophilic women. June O’Connor is concerned that Daly implies that women’s groups that are not radically feminist are “spinning their wheels” in their attempts to deal with the oppression of women.⁸⁴ Christine Allen is bothered by Daly’s inclination to place her whole confidence in her own intuition without reference to external criteria.⁸⁵ Michael Berenbaum is concerned about the *ad hominem* form of some of Daly’s argument that seem designed to silence all opponents. He writes:

[suffering and self-righteousness] expresses itself in the implied superiority which proceeds from the total renunciation of the oppressor, his culture, and the impotent masses who do not effectively oppose him. Insofar as the oppressor’s system is morally bankrupt, the victims of this oppression feel justified in dismissing any outside criticism of themselves.⁸⁶

Vicky Cosstick notes that Daly makes few concessions for others’ views within feminism.⁸⁷ Rita Gross observes that there is a shift in audience from *Beyond God the Father* to *Gyn/Ecology*, the shift being from a wider to a narrower audience, “only that portion of the women’s liberation movement that advocates separation because it sees the wider cultural milieu as totally, radically

⁸⁴ O’Connor, p. 113.

⁸⁵ Allen, p. 71.

⁸⁶ Berenbaum, p. 109.

⁸⁷ Cosstick, p. 4.

and completely untransformable.” Gross adds, “Other feminists can hardly fail to notice the not-so-subtle intimations that no other outlook is acceptably feminist.”⁸⁸ Ann-Janine Morey-Gaines finds Daly’s use of the metaphor so bound up with Daly herself that one is always at risk of conducting an *ad hominem* argument in critiquing her work. Because Daly’s books are a chronicle of her own personal growth and because Daly “so frequently engages in self-protective rhetoric...to hesitate or halt before her visionary doors is to be a patriarchal puppet, and by definition unfit to comment on her work.”⁸⁹

Ross Kraemer adds to this conclusion:

Daly’s arguments are so structured as to be impervious to falsification. By definition, the inescapable participation of all men in patriarchal societies renders them unfit critics. Those women, particularly those who call themselves feminists, who take issue with Daly’s major premises and conclusions, especially her call for total separation from the community of men, are refuted in advance by labelling them ‘token feminists’ who have failed to see through the patriarchal deceptions.⁹⁰

Mary Ann Stenger is disquieted by the fact that Daly freely castigates male one-sidedness without acknowledging her own.⁹¹

Finally, several of Daly’s critics believe her designation of sexism as the root explanation of the trouble that bedevils women in patriarchal society to be inadequate. Carol Christ believes that the explanation is too simple.⁹² Margaret Simons understands sexism as only one of the roots of the oppression of women: she finds Daly lacking in appreciation of the experiences of minority

⁸⁸ Gross, p. 48.

⁸⁹ Ann-Janine Morey-Gaines, “Metaphor and Radical Feminism: Some Cautionary Comments on Mary Daly’s *Gyn/Ecology*,” *Soundings* 65, 3 (1982), p. 345.

⁹⁰ Kraemer, p. 355.

⁹¹ Stenger, p. 230.

⁹² Christ, pp. 205-206.

women.⁹³ Ross Kraemer detects substantive problems in Daly's monolithic view of the male, her failure to look at male on male violence, and her homogenization of all males. For her, Daly simply reverses what patriarchy has done to women.⁹⁴ Marjorie Suchocki questions Daly's conclusions around innate male/female dualisms that seem only to reverse and reproduce the myth we already have.⁹⁵ Linda Alcoff believes that Daly has fallen into biological reductionism and essentialism in her explanation of sexism as the root of male hatred of women. Alcoff finds Daly's approach factually and philosophically indefensible.⁹⁶ Mary Ann Stenger acknowledges that Daly does not explicitly say that men are excluded from the ontophany women are bringing about, but she observes that Daly is clearly only talking about women in Biophilic terms and only talking about men in necrophilic terms. It appears that with sexism Daly only exchanges one idolatry for another. "To leave out the male element of humanity in presenting her philosophy and ethics is as potentially dehumanizing and destructive as the subordination of females in patriarchal theology and ethics."⁹⁷ Rosemary Ruether sees sexism as "a massive historical crime against the personhood of women."⁹⁸ but she is unable to draw the kind of conclusions that Daly has about male and female nature, and the solution to the problem of sexism as a separatist future for women. Marsha Hewitt contends that by replacing capitalism with sexism as the root of women's problems, "Daly dangerously narrows the scope of domination and simplifies its dynamics, reducing it to a basic antagonism between male and female."⁹⁹ Flora Keshgegian's observation that Daly needs patriarchy for her own work both to exist and survive, corresponds to an

⁹³ Simons, pp. 395-396.

⁹⁴ Kraemer, p. 356.

⁹⁵ Suchocki, pp. 308-309.

⁹⁶ Alcoff, pp. 408-409, 413.

⁹⁷ Stenger, p.476.

⁹⁸ Ruether, *Disputed Questions*, p. 127.

Horneyan understanding of the need for an unhelpful defence mechanism to maintain the unhealthy *status quo*. Keshgegian writes, “Patriarchy has to remain intact for Daly’s system to work and even to exist, since Daly defines herself in opposition to that patriarchy.”¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

In light of all that has been presented in the previous nineteen pages, and in conjunction with the arguments presented in Chapter Four, along with the supporting material presented in the first three chapters I believe that a convincing case has been put forth for concluding that Mary Daly’s psychological paradigm is inadequate in comparison to Karen Horney’s. Their descriptions of psychological pathology’s roots, characteristics and their proposed resolutions have been compared and contrasted. The faulty ontology underlying Daly’s psychological paradigm has been suggested to be what leads her to a psychological description of men and women that does not correlate sufficiently with the psychology of ordinary men and women encountered in everyday life. I have argued that the reason that Daly failed in this undertaking is her political belief that misogyny is the root evil of patriarchy, a belief that caused her to create a one-sided ontology of patriarchal men and women and Biophilic women. She then translated this ontology into a one-sided psychological paradigm of patriarchal men and women and Biophilic women. I have shown that there are several of those who comment on Daly’s work who take issue in one way or another with her ontology and with her belief that misogyny is the root of patriarchal evil, although they do not offer an alternative ontology or suggest an alternative root to patriarchal evil: this is Karen Horney’s contribution.

⁹⁹ Marsha Hewitt, p. 138.

¹⁰⁰ Keshgegian, p. 256.

Karen Horney's understanding of self-hate as the root of psychological pathology appears to me to be more helpful for understanding the psychological implications of the social organization Daly calls patriarchy. Self-hate as Horney understands it calls upon both men and women to take whatever part of the blame for the pathological situation that is their own. It calls upon both men and women to deconstruct the false selves that have been constructed to cope with the oppressive situations they have encountered. It also requires them to simultaneously nurture to growth the genuine capacities that exist in themselves. Deems M. Brooks, "Communication and Mental Health: Psychiatric Forerunners," points out that Horney also recommends an awareness of wishes, feelings, and inner conflicts; a development of a personal code of ethics; a willingness to move towards the resolution of one's inner conflicts, and a willingness to take responsibility for the choices one makes.¹⁰¹ Because of the call for genuine growth that Horney's understanding of psychological pathology entails, I suggest that self-hate be considered as possibly the political root of patriarchal pathology. Horney's understanding of self-hate as the wrongful arrogation of rights, privileges and characteristics to oneself to the exclusion of others, and the wrongful discarding of responsibilities, obligations, and disliked characteristics onto others to the exclusion of oneself seems to apply to the many pathological ideological "isms" of our patriarchal world whether that be capitalism, racism, classism, ethnocentrism, ageism, and sexism. The key to understanding this suggestion is a willingness to focus on the "arrogation" element of self-hate. Whether actions or ideas hurtful to others and oneself are large or small, I believe that there is a large element of wrongful arrogation involved. In a capitalist society, for example, the few arrogate to themselves the resources that belong to all claiming their right to

¹⁰¹ Deems M. Brooks, "Communication and Mental Health: Psychiatric Forerunners" (paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, April 12, 1984), pp. 10-11.

such privilege as attendant to their superior intellectual endowment and work ethic. Those impoverished by this arrogation of resources are often characterized as stupid and lazy.

I believe that feminist scholars in whatever discipline ought to consider the work of Karen Horney as they endeavour to understand the social and psychological forces that have undermined women's well-being in the past and that continue to do so into the present. They should not be put off by the metaphors she uses to describe pathological behaviour. Rather, they should be willing to mine her metaphors for their everyday significance and cognitive accessibility to ordinary people. The continued reissuing of her books witnesses to the relevance many ordinary people find in her conceptualization of what troubles us emotionally.

For scholars interested in women and gender it seems to me to be imperative that a more helpful understanding of what is socially and psychologically at the root of the pathology of patriarchal religion, and of patriarchy itself, be found. I believe that Karen Horney's understanding of self-hate and her careful analysis of how a person can reclaim her or his real, ordinary self offers such an understanding, giving room for a dialogue between the sexes that a belief in misogyny as the root of the problem can not.¹⁰²

¹⁰² There are two doctoral theses that apply Horney's theory to areas of concern in religious studies. See: Barbara Jean Horfrichter, *Divinity of Peace: Beyond Mastery/Slavery Toward Wholeheartedness* (School of Theology at Claremont, University Microfilms, 1985); and Patricia Ann Cooney, "Karen Horney's Psychological Theory and its Implications for a Christian Feminist Spirituality" (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1987).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOOKS: PRIMARY SOURCES

Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

_____. *The Church and the Second Sex*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

_____. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978.

_____. *Outercourse: The Be-Dazzling Journey*. San Francisco: Harper, 1992.

_____, and Jane Caputi. *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.

Horney, Karen, M.D. *The Adolescent Diaries of Karen Horney*. New York: Basic Books, 1980.

_____. *Feminine Psychology*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

_____. *Final Lectures*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.

_____. *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1950.

_____. *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1937.

_____. *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1939.

_____. *Our Inner Conflicts: A Constructive Theory of Neurosis*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1945.

_____. *Self-Analysis*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1942.

_____, ed. *Are You Considering Psychoanalysis?* New York: W.W. Norton, 1946.

2. ARTICLES: PRIMARY SOURCES

Daly, Mary. "Abortion and Sexual Caste." *Commonweal*, 95 (1972): 415-19.

_____. "After the Death of God the Father." *Commonweal*, 94 (1972): 7-11.

_____. "Be-Witching: Recalling the Courage to Sin." Paper presented at Porter Hall, Carleton University, Ottawa, March 31, 1985.

- _____. "A Built-in-Bias." *Commonweal*, 81 (1965): 508-11.
- _____. "A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion." *The Unitarian Universalist Christian*, 27 (1972): 23-7.
- _____. "Christian Mission After the Death of God." In *Demands for Christian Renewal*, edited by William J. Wilson, 1-18. Maryknoll: Maryknoll Publications, 1968.
- _____. "The Church and Women: An Interview with Mary Daly," edited by L.I. Stell, *Theology Today*, 28 (1971): 349-54.
- _____. "The Church Versus Women." In *Conversations with Controversial Catholics*, edited by Edward Wakin, 33-44. Dayton: Pflaum Press, 1969.
- _____. "Correspondence." *Commonweal*, 79 (1963): 603.
- _____. "The Courage to Leave: A Response to John Cobb's Theology." In *John Cobb's Theology in Process*, edited by David R. Griffin and Thomas J.J. Altizer, 84-98. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- _____. "The Courage to See." *The Christian Century*, 88 (1971): 1108-11.
- _____. "Critic's Choices." *Commonweal*, 93 (1970/71): 526.
- _____. "Dispensing with Trivia." *Commonweal*, 88 (1968): 322-25.
- _____. "The End of God the Father." *Intellectual Digest*, 3 (1973): 62-3.
- _____. "For and Against Us - Antichauvinist Males and Women's Liberation." *Social Policy*, 3 (1973): 32-4.
- _____. Forward to *Women, Church and State*, by Matilda Joselyn Gage. Watertown: Persephone Press, 1980.
- _____. "God is a Verb." *Ms.*, 3 (December 1974): 58-62, 96-8.
- _____. "If You Could Make One Change in the Church What Would It Be?" *Commonweal*, 92 (1970): 161-62.
- _____. "Mary Daly and the Second Sex." Interview by E. Marion, *U.S. Catholic*, 34 (1968): 21-4.
- _____. "Mary Daly on the Church." *Commonweal*, 9 (1969): 215.

- _____. "Post-Christian Theology: Some Connections Between Idolatry and Methodolatry, Between Deicide and Methodicide." In *Women and Religion*, edited by Judith Plaskow and Joan A. Romero, 33-8. Missoula: American Academy of Religion, 1973.
- _____. "The Problem of Hope." *Commonweal*, 92 (1970): 314-17.
- _____. "The Qualitative Leap Beyond Patriarchal Religion." *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly*, 1 (1975): 20-40.
- _____. "Radical Feminism and Radical Religion." In *Women and Religion*, edited by Elizabeth Clark and Herbert Richardson, 259-71. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- _____. "Return of the Protestant Principle." *Commonweal*, 90 (1969): 338-41.
- _____. "A Short Essay on Hearing and the Qualitative Leap of Radical Feminism." *Horizons*, 2 (1975): 120-24.
- _____. "Sparkling the Fire of Female Friendship." *Chrysalis*, 6 (1979): 27-38.
- _____. "The Spiritual Revolution: Women's Liberation as Theological Re-Education." *Andover-Newton Quarterly*, 12 (1972): 163-76.
- _____. "Theology After the Demise of God the Father: A Call for the Castration of Sexist Religion." In *Sexist Religion and Women in the Church*, edited by Alice Hageman, 125-42. New York: Association Press, 1974.
- _____. "Toward Partnership in the Church." In *Voices of the New Feminism*, edited by Mary Lou Thompson, 136-51. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- _____. "Wanderlust Wonderlust- Remembering the Elemental Powers of Women." *Dalhousie Review*, 4 (1984): 666-86.
- _____. "Watergate: Religious Issues and Answers." *The Christian Century*, 90 (1973): 942.
- _____. "Why Speak About God?" In *Womanspirit Rising*, edited by Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow, 210-18. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- _____. "Women and the Catholic Church." In *Sisterhood is Powerful*, edited by Robin Morgan, 124-38. New York: Random House, 1970.

- _____. "The Women's Movement: An Exodus Community." *Religious Education*, 67 (1972): 327-35.
- _____. "Zeroing in on Freedom." *Commonweal*, 86 (1967): 316-17.
- Daly, Mary F. "The Problem of Speculative Theology." *Thomist*, 29 (1965): 177-216.
- Horney, Karen, M.D. "Can You Take a Stand?" *Journal of Adult Education*, 11 (1939): 129.
- _____. "Conceptions and Misconceptions of the Analytic Method." *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 81 (1935): 399.
- _____. "Concepts and Misconcepts of the Analytic Method." *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, 32 (1934): 880.
- _____. "Culture and Aggression: Some Thoughts and Doubts About Freud's Death Drive and Destructive Drive." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 20 (1960): 130.
- _____. "Culture and Neurosis." *American Sociological Review*, 1 (1936): 221.
- _____. "Forward to a Letter: Finding the Real Self." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 9 (1949): 3.
- _____. "The Future of Psychoanalysis." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 6 (1946): 66.
- _____. "Inhibitions in Work." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 7 (1947): 581.
- _____. "Maturity and the Individual." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 7 (1947): 85.
- _____. "A Morality of Evolution." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 10 (1950): 64.
- _____. "On Difficulties in Dealing with the Transference." *Newsletter, American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers*, 5 (1935): 1.
- _____. "On Feeling Abused." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 11 (1951): 5.
- _____. "On Rank's Modern Education: A Critique of Its Fundamental Ideas." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 1 (1932): 349.
- _____. "The Paucity of Our Inner Experiences." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 12 (1952): 3.
- _____. "The Problem of the Negative Therapeutic Reaction." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 5 (1936): 29.

- _____. "Restricted Applications of Psychoanalysis to Social Work." *The Family*, 15 (1934): 169.
- _____. "The Search For Glory." *Pastoral Psychology*, 1(1950): 13.
- _____. "Speech on the Tenth Anniversary of the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis." *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 11 (1951): 3.
- _____. "The Value of Vindictiveness." *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 8 (1948): 3.
- _____. "What is a Neurosis?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 45 (1939): 426.
- _____. "Women's Fear of Action." In *Karen Horney: A Psychoanalyst's Search for Self-Understanding*, by Bernard J. Paris, 232-238. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

3. BOOKS: SECONDARY SOURCES

- Barstow, Anne Llewellyn. *Witchcraze: A New History of the European Witch Hunts*. London: Pandora, 1994.
- Baruch, Elaine Hoffman, and Lucienne J. Serrano. *Women Analyze Women: In France, England, and the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1988.
- Brown, J.A.C. *Freud and the Post-Freudians*. Markham: Penguin, 1961.
- Brown, Joanne Carlson, and Carole R. Bohn, eds. *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989.
- Chodorow, Nancy J. *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Christ, Carol P. and Judith Plaskow, eds. *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Clark, Elizabeth, and Herbert Richardson, eds. *Women and Religion: A Feminist Sourcebook of Christian Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Cooley, Paula M., William R. Eakin, and Jay B. McDaniel, eds. *After Patriarchy: Feminist Transformations of the World Religions*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

- Dinnerstein, Dorothy. *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise*. New York: HarperCollins, 1976.
- Ellenberger, Henri F. *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Elshtain, Joan Bethke. *Women & War*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Flax, Jane. *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, & Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. Berkeley: California University Press, 1990.
- French, Marilyn. *The War Against Women*. Toronto: Summit Books, 1992.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Goldenberg, Naomi R. *Changing of the Gods: Feminism and the End of Traditional Religions*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.
- _____. *Returning Words to Flesh: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Resurrection of the Body*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1990.
- Hampson, Daphne. *Theology and Feminism*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Hewitt, Marsha Aileen. *Critical Theory of Religion: A Feminist Analysis*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Hoagland, Sarah Lucia. *Lesbian Ethics*. Palo Alto: Institute of Lesbian Studies, 1983.
- Hofrichter, Barbara Jean. *Divinity of Peace: Beyond Mastery/Slavery Toward Wholeheartedness*. School of Theology at Claremont, University Microfilms, 1985.
- Johnson, Karen. *Trusting Ourselves: The Complete Guide to Emotional Well-Being for Women*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1991.
- Keller, Catherine. *From a Broken Web: Separation, Sexism, and Self*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.

- Keshgegian, Flora Angel. *To Know By Heart: Toward a Theology For Remembering For Salvation*. Boston College: University Microfilms, 1992.
- Loades, Ann. *Feminist Theology: A Reader*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- MacCannell, Juliet Flower. *The Regime of the Brother: After the Patriarchy*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Masterson, James F., M.D. *The Search For the Real Self: Unmasking the Personality Disorders of Our Age*. New York: Free Press, 1988.
- Mitchell, Juliette. *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. Markham: Penguin, 1974.
- Nye, Andrea. *Feminist Theories and the Philosophies of Man*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Paris, Bernard J. *Karen Horney: A Psychiatrist's Search for Self Understanding*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Plaskow, Judith, and Carol P. Christ, eds. *Weaving the Visions: New Patterns in Feminist Spirituality*. San Francisco, HarperCollins, 1989.
- Quinn, Susan. *A Mind of Her Own: The Life of Karen Horney*. Don Mills: Addison-Wesley, 1988.
- Radford, Jill and Diana E.H. Russell, eds. *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*. Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline. *Feminism and the Contradictions of Oppression*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Reber, Arthur s. *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology*. Markham: Penguin, 1985.
- Roazen, Paul. *Encountering Freud: The Politics and Histories of Psychoanalysis*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1990.
- Rubin, Theodore Isaac, M.D. *Compassion and Self-Hate: An Alternative to Despair*. New York: Collier, 1975.
- Rubins, Jack L., M.D. *Karen Horney: Gentle Rebel of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Dial Press, 1978.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Disputed Questions: On Being a Christian*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1989.

_____. *Mary- The Feminine Face of the Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

_____. *New Women New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation*. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

_____. *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1983.

_____. *To Change the World: Christology and Cultural Criticism*. London: SCM Press, 1981.

_____. *Women-Church: Theology and Practice*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.

Saul, John Ralston. *Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West*. Toronto: Penguin, 1992.

Sayers, Janet. *Mothering Psychoanalysis: Helen Deutsch, Karen Horney, Anna Freud, Melanie Klein*. London: Hammish Hamilton, 1991.

Smith, Joan. *Misogynies*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1989.

Smith, J.C. *Psychoanalytic Roots of Patriarchy: The Neurotic Foundations of Social Order*. New York: New York University Press, 1990.

Thurer, Shari L. *The Myths of Motherhood: How Culture Reinvents the Good Mother*. Toronto: Penguin, 1994.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. *The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and Other Essays*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1969.

Warner, Marina. *Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary*. London: Picador, 1976.

Westkott, Marcia. *The Feminist Legacy of Karen Horney*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

4. ARTICLES: SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Carol J. "Mary, Mary Quite Contrary." *Women's Review of Books*, (1993): 1,3.

- Alcoff, Linda. "Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory." *Signs*, 13 (1988): 405-436.
- Allen, Christine G. "Self-Creation and Loss of Self: Mary Daly and St. Teresa of Avila." *Studies in Religion*, 6, 1 (1976/77): 67-72.
- Andolsen, Barbara Hilkert. "Racism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Women's Movement: An Ethical Appraisal." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt College, 1981.
- Berenbaum, Michael. "Women, Blacks, and Jews: Theologians of Survival." *Religion in Life*, 45 (1976): 106-118.
- Berry, Wanda Warren. "Feminist Theology: The 'Verbing' of Ultimate/Intimate Reality in Mary Daly." *Ultimate Reality and Meaning*, 11 (1988): 212-232.
- _____. "Images of Sin and Salvation in Feminist Theology." *The Anglican Theological Review*, 60 (1978): 25-54.
- Blackwell, Diana. "Animal Rights, Human Wrongs." *The Women's Review of Books*, 6, 9 (1989): 16.
- Boigon, Helen W. "Horney's Concept of Basic Anxiety: Its Relationship to the Phenomenon of Violence." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 25 (1965): 142-157.
- Brooks, Deems M. "Communication and Mental Health: Psychiatric Forerunners." Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, April 12, 1984.
- Brown, Meryl. "Application of Horney Theory in the Treatment of a Traumatized Child." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 47, 1 (1987): 3-20.
- Bryan, G. McLeod. "Does Feminist Theology Liberate?" *Foundations*, 19 (1976): 40-49.
- Burkhart, John E. "Mary Daly: Theological Orphan?" *Horizons*, 2 (1975): 119-120.
- Cameron, D. Ewen, M.D. "Karen Horney: A Pioneer in the Science of Human Relations." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 14 (1954): 19-29.
- Campbell, Debra. "Dorothy Dohen's Reclamation of Virginity." *The Christian Century*, 105 (1988): 667-670.

- Cantor, Morton B., M.D. "The Horney Centennial." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 4 (1986):363.
- Carr, Anne. "Is a Christian Feminist Theology Possible?" *Theological Studies*, 43 (1982): 279-297.
- Cherry, Rona and Lawrence Cherry. "Karen Horney: The Psychiatrist Who Walked Out On Freud." *Ms*, 3, 12(1975): 112, 114-116.
- Christ, Carol P. "Embodied Thinking: Reflections on Feminist Theological Method." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 5, 2 (1989): 7-15.
- Clemmens, Edward R., M.D. "On the Essence of Human Nature." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 1 (1986): 3-5.
- Cobb, John B. "Feminism and Process Thought: A Two-Way Relationship." In *Feminism and Process Thought*, edited by Sheila Davaney, 32-61. Leviston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1981.
- _____. "Response to Daly." In *John Cobb's Theology in Process*, edited by David R. Griffin and Thomas J.J. Altizer, 171-176. Philadelphia: West Minster Press, 1977.
- Cole, Susan G. "All Women." *Broadside*, 1 (May 1979): 15.
- Coles, Robert. "Karen Horney's Flight from Orthodoxy." In *Women & Analysis: Dialogues on Psychoanalytic Views of Femininity*, edited by Jean Strouse, 187-191. New York: Grossman, 1974.
- Cooney, Patricia Ann. "Karen Horney's Psychological Theory and Its Implications for a Christian Feminist Spirituality." Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1987.
- Cooper, Burton. "Metaphysics, Christology and Sexism: An Essay in Philosophical Theology." *Religious Studies*, 16 (1980): 179-193.
- Coser, Lewis A. "Karen Horney (1885-1952): Cultural Critic and Theorist of Feminism." In *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences*, by Lewis A. Coser, 76-82. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Cosstick, Vicky. "Here Comes the Gyn-Ecologist, the Gynocrat." *Kinesis*, (April/May 1979): 3.
- _____. "Mary Daly: Feminist Philosopher." *Kinesis*, (April/May 1979): 3-4.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "Remembering Her: Feminist Readings of the Christian Tradition."

Toronto Journal of Theology, 2, 1 (1986): 118-126.

Danielian, Jack. "The Horney Centennial." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 4 (1986): 364-366.

_____. "Horney's Metapsychology and Western Culture." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, 2 (1974): 135-139.

Darter, Sarah L. "Response To 'Does Feminist Theology Liberate?'" *Foundations*, 19 (1976): 50-52.

Davaney, Sheila G. "The Limits of the Appeal to Women's Experience." In *Shaping New Vision: Gender and Values in American Culture*, edited by Clarissa W. Atkinson, Constance H. Buchanan, and Margaret Miles, 31-49. Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987.

Davies, Kathleen. "The Goddess in the Landscape: A Tradition of Twentieth-Century American Women's Pastoral." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1991.

De Rosis, Helen, M.D. "Dedication." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35, 2 (1975): 99-100.

De Rosis, Louis, M.D. "Horney Theory and Narcissism." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 41, 4 (1981): 337-354.

_____. "The Invented Self: Karen Horney's Theory Applied to Psychoanalysis in Groups: Part 1." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, 2 (1974): 109-121.

_____. "The Invented Self: Karen Horney's Theory Applied to Psychoanalysis in Groups: Part 2." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, 3 (1974): 199-212.

Douglas, Carol Ann. "Mary Daly Speaks and Sparks." *Off Our Backs*, 14 (1984): 22-23.

_____. Review of *Pure Lust*, by Mary Daly. *Off Our Backs*, 14 (1984): 20-21.

Eckart, Marianne Horney, M.D. "The Detached Person: A Discussion With A Phenomenological Bias." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 20, 2 (1960): 139-163.

_____. "Life is a Juggling Act: Our Concepts of 'Normal' Development- Myth or Reality." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35, 2 (1975): 103-113.

- Ellis, L. "Sex Differences in Criminality: An Explanation Based on the Concept of r/K Selection." *The Mankind Quarterly*, 30, 1&2 (1989): 17-38.
- Engelsman, Joan Chamberlain. "Patterns in Christian Feminism: A Bibliographic Essay." *The Drew Gateway*, 56, 1 (1985): 1-15.
- Evans, Ruth. "Women as Other: A Study of Alienation in Rosemary Ruether, Mary Daly and Sheila Collins." Master's thesis, University of St. Michael's College, 1980.
- Everson, Susan Corey. "Women's Bodily Experience in Recent Feminist Theology and Literature." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1984.
- Field-Bibb, Jacqueline. "From the Church to Wickedary: The Theology and Philosophy of Mary Daly." *The Modern Churchman*, 30, 4 (1989): 35-41.
- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. "Why Not a Category of Friend/Friendship?" *Horizons*, 2 (1975): 117-118.
- Frenz, Adena. "Pure Lust: The Times of Mary Daly." *Herizons*, 2, 7 (1984): 42-43.
- Frye, Marilyn. "Famous Lust Words." *The Women's Review of Books*, 1, 11 (1984): 42-43.
- Garrison, Dee. "Karen Horney on Feminism." *Signs*, 6, 4 (1981): 672-691.
- Gibson, Patty. "Women Are Denied Their Souls." *Kinesis*, (April 1983): 21.
- Gowen, Julie. "Ought We To Abandon a Traditional Christian World-View?" *Studies in Religion*, 8, 1 (1979): 83-92.
- Greisman, Harvey C. "Matriarchate as Utopia, Myth and Social Theory." *Sociology*, 15, 3 (1981): 321-336.
- Grimshaw, Jean. "'Pure Lust': The Elemental Feminist Philosophy of Mary Daly." *Radical Philosophy*, 49 (1988): 24-30.
- Gross, Rita M. "Bitterness and Effectiveness: Reflections on Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*." *Anima*, 7 (1980): 47-51.
- Halberstam, Judith. "Automating Gender: Postmodern Feminism in the Age of the Intelligent Machine." *Feminist Studies*, 17 (1991): 439-460.

- Halkes, Catherine J.M. "The Themes of Protest in Feminist Theology Against God the Father." In *God as Father*, edited by J. Metz, translated by D. Smith, 103-110. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- Harrison, Beverly Wildung. "The Power of Anger in the Work of Love: Christian Ethics for Women and Other Strangers." In *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, edited by Ann Loades, 194-213. London: SPCK, 1990.
- Harrower, Vivian Jarret. "Feminist Critiques of a Male Saviour: Christology in the Writings of Mary Daly and Rosemary Ruether." Master's thesis, University of St. Michael's College, 1985.
- Hasan, M. "On Being Powerless in Power." *Race and Class*, 28, 4 (1987): 546-560.
- Hearn, Virginia K. "Metapatriarchy: Mary Daly Reviewed: A Response to Susan Henking." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), pp. 217-222.
- Hedley, Jane. "Surviving To Speak New Language: Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich." *Hypatia*, 7 (1992): 40-62.
- Henking, Susan E. "The Personal Is Theological: Autobiographical Acts in Contemporary Feminist Theology." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 59, 3 (1991): 511-525.
- _____. "Rejected, Reclaimed, Renamed: Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion." *Journal of Psychology and Religion*, 21, 3 (1993): 199-207.
- Heyward, Carter. "Speaking and Sparking, Building and Burning: Ruether and Daly, Theologians." *Christianity and Crisis*, 39 (1979): 66-72.
- Hirschboeck, Paula. "Soul Making Women: A Philosophical Exploration of Imaginal Feminisms." Ph.D. diss., Union Institute, 1992.
- Howell, Nancy R. "Radical Relatedness and Feminist Separatism." *Process Studies*, 18 (1989): 118-126.
- Ingram, Douglas, H., M.D. "Karen Horney at 100: Beyond the Frontier." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 45, 4 (1985): 305-309.

- Kelman, Norman. M.D. "In Memoriam." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 13 (1953): 5-7.
- _____, ed., "Tributes.", "Memorial Meeting for Karen Horney.", and "Obituary." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 13 (1953): 8-13.
- Keyishan, Harry. "Karen Horney on 'The Value of Vindictiveness'." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 442, 1 (1982): 21-26.
- Kraemer, Ross. S. "Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism." *Signs*, 5, 2 (1979): 354-356.
- Lefevre, Perry D. "Liberation Theology: Feminist." *Chicago Theology Seminary Register*, 72, 2 (1982): 33-39.
- Little, Joyce A. "Mary Daly's *Pure Lust*: A Symposium." *Catholicism in Crisis*, (October 1984): 33-42.
- Loades, Ann. "Practical Consequences." In *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, edited by Ann Loades, 181-189. London: SPCK, 1990.
- _____. "The Virgin Mary and the Feminist Quest." In *After Eve*, edited by Janet Martin Soskice, 156-178. London: Collins, 1990.
- Lussheimer, Paul. "Horney's Heritage." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 23, 1 (1963): 3-4.
- Maher, Mary M. Review of *Pure Lust*, by Mary Daly. *Women and Therapy*, 4 (1985): 76-78.
- Malec, Michael. "Incident at Boston College: Phasing Out Mary Daly." *Commonweal*, (April 4, 1969): 61-62.
- Martin, B. "Merit and Power." *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 22 (1987): 436-451.
- Martin, Alexander Reid, M.D. "Karen Horney's Theory in Today's World." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35, 4 (1975): 297-302.
- Martindale, Kathleen. Review of *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy*, by Mary Daly. *RFR/DRF*, 13, 3 (1984): 54-55.
- Martinez, Zulma Nelly. "From a Mimetic to a Holographic Paradigm in Fiction: Toward a Definition of Feminist Writing." *Women's Studies*, 14 (1988): 25.

- Masserman, Jules H., M.D. "Anxiety Revisited." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 25 (1965): 115-117.
- Miller, Casey and Kate Smith. "Women and the Language of Religion." *The Christian Century*, 93 (1976): 353-358.
- Moglen, Helen. "Power and Empowerment." *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6, 2 (1983): 131-134.
- Morey-Gaines, Ann-Janine. "Metaphor and Radical Feminism: Some Cautionary Comments of Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*." *Soundings*, 65 (1982): 340-351.
- Moulton, Carlyn. "Spooking the Snools: Scriptures According to Daly." *Broadside*, 6, 3 (1985): 10-11.
- Moulton, Ruth. "Early Papers on Women: Horney to Thompson." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35, 3 (1975): 207-223.
- Mullan, Hugh. "Horney's Contribution To a Rational Approach to Morals." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 48, 2 (1988): 127-137.
- Oberndorf, C.P., M.D. "Obituary." *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 34, 2 (1953).
- Obituaries. "Karen Horney Funeral Will Be Held Today." *New York Times*, December 6, 1952.
- O'Connell, Agnes N. "Karen Horney: Theorist in Psychoanalysis and Feminine Psychology." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 1 (1980): 81-93.
- O'Connor, June. "Liberation Theologies and the Women's Movement: Points of Comparison and Contrast." *Horizons*, 2 (1975): 103-113.
- _____. "Two Critical Questions." *Horizons*, 2 (1975): 114-115.
- Olds, Linda E. "Metaphors of Hierarchy and Interrelatedness in Hildegard of Bingen and Mary Daly." *Listening*, 24 (1989): 54-66.
- Payne-O'Connor, Josephine. "Comment on Kraemer's Review of *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*." *Signs*, 6, 2 (1980): 340-342.
- Penelope, Julia. "Erratic, Ecstatic, Eccentric." *The Women's Review of Books*, 5, 3 (1987): 5-6.

- Peterson, Nancy J. "The Politics of Language: Feminist Theory and the Contemporary Work of Women of Color." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1991.
- Phillips, John A. "'Mother Incest So Familiar To Us': Psychoanalysis and the Myth of Eve." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 1 (1986): 6-14.
- Phipps, William E. "Adam's Rib: Bone of Contention." *TheologyToday*, 33 (1976): 263-273.
- Picchi, Mary Spaulding. "Women Becoming: Through Books and Bonding." *Journal of Women and Religion*, 2, 1 (1982): 38-41.
- Porper, Rebecca. Review of *Gyn/Ecology*, by Mary Daly. *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 35, 12 (1979/1980): 126-128.
- Porterfield, Amanda. "Feminist Theology as a Revitalization Movement." *Sociological Analysis*, 48 (1987): 234-244.
- Quant, Midge. "Mary Daly's Latest Philosophical Quest." *New Directions for Women*, 13 (1984): 14.
- Raschke, Carl A. "Death of God the Father." *Iliff Review*, 35 (1978): 55-64.
- Ratterman, Debra. "Chasing Through the Wickedary." *Off Our Backs*, 18 (1988): 17.
- Rieger, Renate. "Half of Heaven Belongs to Women, And They Must Win It For Themselves: Feminist Theological Stock-Taking in the Federal Republic of Germany." *Journal of Feminist Studies*, 1, 1 (1985): 133-144.
- Roach, Richard, S.J. "Mary Daly's *Pure Lust*." *Catholicism in Crisis*, (October 1984): 33-42.
- Rodwell, Florence. "Mary Daly's Vision: No Means Know." Master's thesis, University of Guelph, 1992.
- Roith, Estelle. "Karen Horney." In *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary*, edited by Elizabeth Wright, 161-162. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1992.
- Rubins, Jack L., M.D. "On the Early Development of the Self: Its Role in Neurosis." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 22, 2 (1962): 122-137.
- Rudolphson, S., M.D. "A Critique of Horney's Theory of Anxiety." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 21, 1 (1961): 27-33.

- Shields, David L. "Christ: A Male Feminist View." *Encounter*, 45 (1984): 221-232.
- Shotter, John and Josephine Logan. "The Pervasiveness of Patriarchy: On Finding a Different Voice." In *Feminist Thought and the Structure of Knowledge*, ed. Mary McConnery Gergen, 69-86. New York: New York University Press, 1988.
- Simmons, Margaret A. "Racism and Feminism: A Schism in the Sisterhood." *Feminist Studies*, 5, 2 (1979): 384-396.
- Sirala, Martti, M.D. "Self-Creating in Therapy." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 23, 2 (1963): 164-174.
- Smith, Erica. "Taking Off on a Journey." *Herizons*, (June/July 1984): 23.
- Smith, M.J.R. "From Sacred to Suspect: Myth as Truth or Lie- A Methodological Inquiry." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1992.
- Smith, Polly Ashton. "Contrasts in Language Theory and Feminist Interpretation." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 35 (1979/1980): 89-98.
- Sontag, Frederick. "Crucifixion and Realized Eschatology: A Critique of Some Proposals Concerning Feminist Theology." *Asian Journal of Theology*, 4 (1990): 66-73.
- Steichen, Donna. "Religion, Reason, Reality: Reinterpreted, Reviled, Repudiated (A Response to Susan Henking's Analysis of Mary Daly's Thought)." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21, 3 (1993), pp. 208-209.
- Steinfels, Peter. "Battle Lines in Feminism and Religion." *New York Times*, 138 (May 10, 1989): 14.
- Stenger, Mary A. "A Critical Analysis of the Influence of Paul Tillich on Mary Daly's Feminist Theology." *Encounter*, 43 (1982): 219-238.
- _____. "Male Over Female or Female Over Male: A Critique of Idolatry." *Soundings*, 69 (1986): 464-477.
- Stover, Ronald G. and Christine A. Hope. "Monotheism and Gender in the Pacific." *Social Forces*, 63, 2 (1984): 335-348.
- Suchocki, Marjorie. "The Challenge of Mary Daly." *Encounter*, 41 (1980): 307-313.

- _____. "The Idea of God in Feminist Philosophy." *Hypatia* 9, 4 (1994), 57-68.
- Svrakic, Dragan M., M.D. "The Real Self of Narcissistic Personalities: A Clinical Approach." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 3 (1986): 219-229.
- Symonds, Alexandra, M.D. "The Liberated Woman: Healthy and Neurotic." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, 3 (1974): 177-185.
- _____. "The Stress of Self-Realization." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 40, 4 (1990): 293-300.
- Thistlethwaite, Susan B. "God and Her Survival in a Nuclear Age." *Journal of Feminist Studies*, 4 (1988): 73-88.
- Tong, Paul K.K. "The Sex of God: A Critique of Mary Daly's Transcendental Theology for Women's Liberation." In *God, Sex, and the Social Project*, edited by J.H. Grace, 39-50. Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1978.
- Trulove, Sarah Chappell, and James Woelfel. "The Feminist Reformation of American Religious Thought." In *Religion and Philosophy in the USA*, Vol. 2, edited by P. Freese, 729-756. Essen: Verlag Die Blaue Eule, 1987.
- Turkel, Ann Ruth, M.D. "Reflections on the Development of Male Chauvinism." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 52, 3 (1992): 263-272.
- Van Den Daele, Leland. "Horney's Theory of Neurosis: A Developmental-Structuralist Interpretation." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 39, 1 (1979): 23-35.
- Vickers, Jill McCalla. "Memoirs of an Ontological Exile: The Methodical Rebellions of Feminist Research." In *Feminism: From Pressure to Politics*, edited by Angela Miles and Geraldine Finn, 37-56. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1989.
- Vitz, Paul C. and Evelyn Birge Vitz, "Pretentious, Preposterous, Pathetic: A Response to Susan Henking and to Mary Daly on Psychology and Religion." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 21, 3 (1993), pp. 210-216.
- Von Jess, Wilma Gundersdorff. "Suffering 'The Scapegoat Syndrome,' and Prophetic Activism." *Horizons*, 2 (1975):115-117.

- Wachtel, Paul L. "Reconsideration: Karen Horney's Ironic Vision." *The New Republic*, (January 6, 1979): 25-28.
- Weiss, Frederick A., M.D. "Karen Horney: Her Early Papers." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 14 (1954): 55-64.
- Westcott, Marcia. "Female Relationality and the Idealized Self." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 49, 3 (1989): 239-250.
- Wilson, Richard Francis. "Human Liberation and Theology: An Examination of the Theology of Gustavo Gutierrez, James H. Cone, and Mary Daly." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Yachnes, Eleanor, M.D. "The Myth of Masculinity: A Panel." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 33, 1 (1972): 56-61.
- _____. "Neurotic Pride." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35, 1 (1975): 27-32.
- Zagano, Phyllis. "Mary Daly's *Pure Lust*: A Symposium." *Catholicism in Crisis*, (October 1984): 33-42.