

## LILLIAN SMITH ON THE SOUTHERN PATRIARCHY AND THE PARADOX OF RELIGION

Pat Brewer  
University of Georgia

Lillian Smith, more than any other Southern woman of the twentieth century, challenged her culture's most basic assumptions regarding religion, sex, and race. Although she did not live to see the profusion of feminist literature which exploded upon the scene in the 1970s and although she would have rejected the label of feminist writer, Smith's critique of the Southern patriarchy, and by extension Western society in general, exhibited in many ways a radical feminist perspective. In exploring the South's historical consciousness, Smith focused her analysis on the influence of religion, sex, and race in legitimating, supporting, and perpetuating the patriarchal system. She recognized that patriarchy, the rule of family, tribe, or society by men, has appeared to be a fundamental and universal cultural reality, and may well be, as Mary Daly has asserted, the "one universal religion" which has pervaded the entire planet.<sup>1</sup>

Certainly the assumptions of masculine primacy are deep-seated in Western culture; yet, in the midst of a culture where patriarchy has reigned supreme, the American South has tended to epitomize patriarchal society and has upheld a patriarchal world view. The South, due to its unique historical experience with slavery, developed a protracted need for the paternalistic construct which, as Gunnar Myrdal has said, linked together women, servants, mules, and other property.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the South developed a racial ideology which both justified and strengthened the fundamental premises of the dominant male culture. The issue of race, added to the basic assumptions of male dominance, resulted in the creation of complex mythologies which served to justify racism and sexism. Together race and sex, buttressed by patriarchal religion, have served well the cause of male dominance and power.

Lillian Smith, in her observation of the Southern patriarchy, regarded the numerous and varied threads that comprised the cloth of Southern culture as too intertwined to be unraveled and examined separately. She believed that attitudes concerning race, sex, class, and religion all functioned symbiotically into making the fabric that was Southern culture. Nevertheless, in Smith's view, religion played a central and pivotal role in shaping, defining, and supporting an

androcentric world view in general and Southern patriarchy in particular.

Smith was outspoken in her criticism of Southern evangelical religion, which she accused of being "un-Christian" in its capitulation to racism, first by its support of slavery, and in the post-bellum period, by its support of slavery's successor as a form of social control-segregation. However, Smith's critique of religion was not parochial but universal in scope, formulated as it was upon a historical and cultural analysis of the role of religion in the Western world.

In the Judeo-Christian tradition God has been all-powerful and male, and the code of morality developed around the religious nexus has been male formulated and dictated. Whereas, as one writer has noted, "The voice of God is the voice of man,"<sup>3</sup> in the South, the voice of God has been the voice of the white man. The mores and customs of the culture regarding race and sex were predicated upon patriarchal assumptions and took on the sacrosanct trappings of biblical morality. Developed under the conditions of patriarchy, theology and ethics have served the interests of a sexist and racist society. Moreover, in connection with moral codes regarding sex, Smith was correct in perceiving the relation between sexual taboos in a culture and sexism.

Mary Douglas has said in her study, *Purity and Danger*, that there are fewer sexual taboos in a society where males can directly enforce their domination, or where society allows a man to punish his wife with direct physical force. When a society ceases to condone the external controls of men over women, such as punishment by death for adultery, wife beating, harems, purdah, and chastity belts, there is a shift to internal control, a system of complex and subtle taboos, frequently elevated to religious doctrine.<sup>4</sup> The code of Southern chivalry similarly depended upon stringent sexual mores cast in religious and moral terms, and then raised, as Wilbur Cash pointed out, to "gynealatrophy" or the romantic adulation of femininity.<sup>5</sup> It was necessary for women to accept the taboos and to internalize the culture's mores and values which, more often than not, were held to be religious fundamentals.

In reality, religion has been more than just a contributing factor, for, in the Judeo-Christian world, religion as a social institution has been a primary determinant of cultural norms.<sup>6</sup> Religion concerns the deepest and most ultimate aspects of human



life and provides a set of symbolic forms and acts that relate man to the ultimate condition of his existence.<sup>7</sup> As a system of symbols religion serves to formulate conceptions about the world which in turn establishes moods and motivations in human beings. These conceptions are clothed in such an aura of factuality that the moods and motivations are perceived as being realistic and are advanced as religious truths.<sup>8</sup>

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, the axis upon which the faith was established was the symbol of the Father God.<sup>9</sup> The ascendancy of the male God of Israel was achieved by the defeat of the principle of the female divinity prevalent among contemporary religions of the Ancient Near East; and as Elaine Pagels has stated, "the God of Israel shared his power with no female divinity."<sup>10</sup> The absence of female symbolism for God marks Judaism, Christianity, and Islam in striking contrast to the world's other religious traditions.<sup>11</sup>

Although twentieth century theologians of all three faiths have been quick to assert that God is not to be considered in sexual terms at all, no one who has grown up in the Jewish or Christian traditions has escaped the clear impression of God's maleness as conveyed in the language and imagery of worship and prayer. Masculine epithets such as king, lord, master, judge, and father abound; and although many gnostic writings contain both androgynous and female imagery, all such imagery for God was purged from orthodox testaments. The Christian creed explicitly begins with the words, "I believe in one God, Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," affirming both monotheism and God's masculinity.<sup>13</sup>

Lillian Smith recognized how myths and symbols have functioned within Southern society to support and maintain secular and religious institutions which are the fulcrums upon which the patriarchy rests. The Southern patriarchy, Smith knew, shared with the rest of Western civilization the central symbol of the Father God, the great patriarch in heaven who rewards and punishes his children according to his mysterious and seemingly arbitrary will.<sup>14</sup> The world view of Western society has been formulated around a Father God who is an outsider God, a God who stands over and above history, alienating man from nature, from himself, and from his fellowman.<sup>15</sup> Religion is the primary ideal which persuades people that the present ordering of society is the acceptable order. What it represents is

what should be. Some theological writers have noted that religion as the product of alienation reflects the pathologies of the society, legitimates the status quo, and projects into the future the continuation of the alienation.<sup>16</sup>

Lillian Smith, too, perceived the alienating and dichotomizing influences of religion on the human psyche and recognized the contradictions inherent in the images of a kind and loving Father and the wrathful and jealous authoritative patriarch. Smith, however, stressed the impact of Protestantism on shaping the world view of a large part of the Western world and the South in particular. She differentiated Protestant from Catholic, she explained, because in her view Catholicism offered its children "more adequate compensation for its renunciations than were given to little Protestants."<sup>17</sup> Although she did not elaborate upon this point, Smith probably viewed the rituals and symbols of Catholicism as well as the numerous intercessional appeals to the saints and the Virgin Mary, as ameliorating the sense of separateness and worthlessness experienced by human beings and reinforced by religious dogma.

Alienation, for Smith the antithesis of wholeness, was a recurrent theme throughout her writing. In Smith's analysis, a prime causal factor of alienation was the simultaneous inculcation of ideas on religion, race, and sex. She believed that the conflicting lessons taught about God to the children of the South tended to stunt their spiritual growth. Children were told that God loved them but would burn them in everlasting flames of hell if they should displease him; and while on the one hand they were told to love God for He gave them everything good that they had, on the other hand they were told to fear Him because He had the power to do evil to them whenever He cared to.<sup>18</sup> Elaborating on the theodicy required by Judeo-Christian theology, Smith lamented that children also learned that parents, though they might love them, had a "right" to do them "great injury" if the children displeased them:

Hence being loved by them does not give you protection from being harmed by them. We learned that they (parents) have a 'right' to act in this way because God does, and that they in a sense represent God, in the family. . . . As the years passed God became the mighty protagonist of ambivalence although we had not heard the word. He loomed before us as the awesome example



of one who injures, even destroys, in the name of 'good' those whom He loves, and does it because he has the right to.<sup>19</sup>

Taught to both love and fear God, children learned to think of Him as having complete power over their lives: "As we were beginning to feel this power and to see it reflected in our parents, we were learning also to fear a power that was in our body and to fear dark people who were everywhere around us. . . ." <sup>20</sup> But there were good moments, too. Just when a child began to think there was no escape from God's vengeful wrath, the preacher would quote more from the New Testament than from the Old Testament: "Sin was (then) shrunk to a stature that our small egos could cope with . . ." <sup>21</sup> But always underlying the warm glow of God's love was the knowledge of "terrible sins" and "forbidden dreams" which could any moment call down upon small heads God's punishment. Children knew, said Smith, that "[God] was Authority. And we bowed before His Power with that pinched quietness of children, stoically resigning ourselves to this Force as it was interpreted by the grown folks." <sup>22</sup>

Southern children were also taught conflicting lessons about their bodies. These lessons more often than not were cast in religious terms. For example, children were told:

God has given you a body which you must keep clean and healthy . . . . But the body itself is a Thing of Shame and you must never show its nakedness to anyone except to the doctor when you are sick. Indeed, you should not look at it much yourself, especially in mirrors. It is true that in a sense your body is yours but it isn't yours to feel at home with. It's God's holy temple and must never be desecrated by pleasure. . . . Now, on the other hand, though your body is a thing of shame and mystery, and curiosity about it is not good, your skin is your glory and the source of your strength and pride. It is white. And, as you have heard, whiteness is a symbol of purity and excellence. Remember this: Your white skin proves that you are better than all other people on the earth. Yes, it does that. And does it simply because it is white-- which, in a way, is a kind of miracle. But the Bible is

full of miracles and it should not be too difficult for us to accept one more . . . . Since this is . . . your skin color is a Badge of Innocence which you can wear as vaingloriously as you please because God gave it to you and hence it is good and right. It gives you priorities over colored people everywhere in the world, and especially those in the South.<sup>23</sup>

As children, Smith continued:

We learned about God, about sex, about race before we began to speak words; and we learned from the people who were dearest to us--our mother and father and nurses. We were trained to feel a certain way about God; a certain way about sex; a certain way about race. We were trained to act out these feelings. The words race and sex were probably not often used by those who trained us, though we learned early to talk easily of God. But attitudes toward sex and race were more deeply ingrained in our personalities, perhaps, than were our feelings for God.<sup>24</sup>

Smith admitted that beliefs that run so deeply in a society are difficult to express, and exaggeration may well be the result of trying. But she was convinced that she had captured the essence of the lessons taught to Southern children, lessons which she said were "learned far more from acts than words, more from a raised eyebrow, a joke, a shocked voice, a withdrawing movement of the body, a long silence, than from long sentences."<sup>25</sup> Indeed, she said, "the lesson on segregation was only a logical extension of the lesson on sex and white superiority and God."<sup>26</sup> Children of the South clung to the belief that their white skin made them better than all other people. Smith said that this belief in the value of their white skin comforted them for they otherwise felt worthless and weak. Fortunately, one's guilt and worthlessness could be ameliorated somewhat by the whiteness of one's skin: "[Here in] in the Land of Epidermis, everyone of us was a little king."<sup>27</sup>

It would be difficult, if not impossible, Smith thought, for anyone not born and raised in the South to understand the complex overlapping of custom and morality, the juxtaposition of the lessons



might on sex, race, and God. She wrote:

By the time we were five years old we had learned without hearing the words, that masturbation is wrong and segregation is right, and each had become a dreaded taboo that must never be broken for we believed God, whom we feared and tried desperately to love, had made the rules concerning not only Him and our parents, but our bodies and Negroes. Therefore, when we as small children crept over the race line and ate and played with Negroes or broke other segregation customs known to us, we felt the same dread fear of consequences, the same overwhelming guilt we felt when we crept over the sex line and played with our body, or thought thoughts about God or our parents that we knew we must not think. Each was a 'sin,' each 'deserved punishment' . . . . Each was tied up with the other and all were tied close to God.<sup>28</sup>

With characteristic ambivalence, Smith regarded Christian principles as potentially vital forces for combating alienation and for creating a sense of wholeness for the individual and for humanity. She was caustically and uncompromisingly critical of churches in the South because she believed that they failed in their Christian mission. The churches, bowing to the dictates of the culture, negated the ideals of love and brotherhood, which were central precepts of Christianity, and gave their tacit support to segregation and other manifestations of dehumanization.<sup>29</sup>

Smith believed that "there was something wrong with a world that tells you love is good and people are important and then forces you to deny love and to humiliate people."<sup>30</sup> There was also something terribly wrong about a culture which dichotomized the body from the soul and segregated one person from another. Smith admonished that "the church, which might have been a guiding principle," had made so grave a compromise with Christian belief on the issue of slavery and race that it lost any credibility as a moral guide.<sup>31</sup>

Had it not been for "religion and southern tradition, which kept them hard at their teaching," Smith asserted, "our mother and father would have weakened" and failed in their role as disseminators of the culture's traditions. When children stepped outside their homes,

"custom and church took charge" of their education. The ambivalence, ambiguities, and contradictions which characterized the teachings of the church developed into a cruel idea "which grew through the centuries into a dragon that devoured the minds of the children of Christendom. . . . Our learning on sin and sex, often taught gently at home, were welded together by the flames of hell."<sup>32</sup> The "patriarchal puritanic system," Smith concluded, "psychically castrated its women, who in turn psychically castrated their children, male, and female."<sup>33</sup> The cost of maintaining an authoritarian patriarchal belief system weighed heavily on everyone within the culture.

But if all the children of the Judeo-Christian heritage were traumatized by the vagaries of an ambivalent God; and if they had the exigencies of daily life cast in threatening religious and moral terms, what psychic damage must have been done to the culture's female children who have had to bear the added burden of Eve's guilt? It was a woman whose sin caused the loss of Paradise, and therein lay reason enough for woman's subjugation. Clearly this is a graphic example of what Pagels suggested was religious myth serving a social and political function.<sup>34</sup>

Lillian Smith regarded the Christian Church as a sexist institution which supported doctrines of male supremacy. She asked rhetorically who it was who had stripped woman of her economic, political, and sexual rights? Who, nearly two thousand years ago, said "it is good for a man not to touch a woman. . . . But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." It was, of course, she said, St. Paul whose misogynistic outburst demonstrated the "patriarchal protest against the ancient matriarch."<sup>35</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, quoting Sir George Frazer, summed up with an economy of words the essence of patriarchal religion: "Men make the gods, women worship them."<sup>36</sup> But de Beauvoir was not content to let the issue rest there. She continued to expound upon the subject of women and religion: "There is a justification, a supreme compensation, which society is ever wont to bestow upon woman: that is religion. There must be a religion for women as there must be one for the common people, and for exactly the same reasons."<sup>37</sup> The evidence strongly suggests that Lillian Smith shared this view.<sup>38</sup>

White women of the South, Smith believed, were caught in a terrible bind by their culture: "The majority of Southern women



convinced themselves that God had ordained that they be deprived of pleasure, and meekly stuffed their hollowness with piety, trying to believe the tightness they felt was hunger satisfied."<sup>39</sup> Having accepted the patriarchal religion, women of the South set about accepting the role established for them by the androcentric culture.

Indeed, a fascinating aspect of cultural transmission within a patriarchy is the role played by women in perpetuating the tenets of a male dictated and dominated society. Within the context of the family,<sup>40</sup> women were given and most often readily assumed the role of moral watchdog for the culture. Socialized as keepers of the male culture, women without question infused into their children the conflicting values of the system. Smith spoke of this sad irony: "The mother who taught me what I know of tenderness and love and compassion taught me also the bleak rituals of keeping Negroes in their 'place.'"<sup>41</sup> And writing of how subtly the intricate system of taboos was installed in the minds of southern children, she wrote:

I do not remember how or when, but by the time I had learned that God is love, that Jesus is His Son and came to give us more abundant life, that all men are brothers with a common Father, I also knew that I was better than a Negro, that all black folks have their place and must be kept in it, that sex has its place and must be kept in it, that a terrifying disaster would befall the South if ever I treated a Negro as my equal and a terrifying disaster would befall my family if ever I were to have a baby outside of marriage. I had learned that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son so that we might have segregated churches.<sup>42</sup>

Women, ironically, were the primary agents used by the patriarchy to indoctrinate children into the culture's dictates. Smith concluded: "These were our first lessons. Wrapped together, they were taught us by our mother's voice, memorized with her love, petted into our lives as she rocked us to sleep or fed us."<sup>43</sup>

Women, de Beauvoir noted, have tended to accept the gods males have created and have accepted the male established social order out of ignorance and the lack of a sense of history and evolution. But also, if they belonged among the privileged elites, they did so in fear that they would lose their "benefits." This

accounted for the conservative bent in most women, said de Beauvoir.<sup>44</sup>

Lillian Smith admonished women to learn to live as "civilized, humane, informed world-citizens, refuting narrow provincialism of thought and feeling."<sup>45</sup> The modern world, continued Smith, cannot survive if the old values of aggressiveness and hostility continue to be the traits most prized by the culture. Writing in pre-nuclear 1941, Smith reminded women that their homes had no walls around them which could protect them from "aerial bombs."<sup>46</sup> If women refused to challenge civilization's outmoded and dangerous value system, they would not only be abettors in their own subjugation but would be instrumental in the destruction of the human race.<sup>47</sup> At one time it may have been in women's best interest to raise hostile and aggressive males, as Marvin Harris has suggested, and to otherwise support the premises of a patriarchal society; but it is no longer so. But lest once again women are blamed for the loss of the planet as they were blamed for the loss of Paradise, it should be noted that in a culture where reality is defined in masculine terms, with masculine myths and symbols, women's perception of reality may be focused through the lens of patriarchal self-interest.

Smith realized that some women could not transcend their culture, or did not want to: "Like their men, many of them found it easier to cultivate hate than love."<sup>48</sup> As the Chinese once had bound their little girls' feet, many women of the South tightly bound their children's spirits in rigid codes of behavior. These women became vigilant guardians of Southern tradition and did not question the package of "sex taboos, race segregation, the right to make money the way Father made money, the duty to go to church, the fear of new knowledge that would shake old beliefs, the splitting of ideal from actions."<sup>49</sup> These women, oppressed by the culture, in turn indoctrinated their children into the system which left in the children an "unquenchable need to feel superior to others, to bow easily to authority, and to value power and money more dearly than human relations and love."<sup>50</sup>

White women too often acquiesced to the role allotted to them by the patriarchal order, accepted their desexualization (even their dehumanization), and, as Richard King has said in his analysis of Smith, turned away from their men and their own bodies and turned toward a religion which strengthened the sexual, psychological, and social order of alienation.<sup>51</sup> Smith concluded sadly that the



"patriarchal [system] had borne strange fruit through the years."<sup>52</sup> Women who ardently embraced the values of the patriarchy were called "poetesses of the bourgeoisie" by de Beauvoir. Smith might have labeled such women "poetesses of the patriarchy."

It is ironic but not surprising that Lillian Smith, who so clearly perceived the fundamental dichotomizing effects of the Judeo-Christian tradition, continued to accept and use the language, myths, and symbols of the patriarchal religion. No doubt she found herself confronted with the dilemma that all feminists face in their critique of the patriarchal Judeo-Christian tradition--absolute rejection of both Judaism and Christianity or a reinterpretation or reconstruction of theology and history in a way that is compatible with feminism.<sup>53</sup>

Thus, Smith displayed a characteristic ambivalence regarding religion. While on the one hand she quite clearly recognized that androcentric Western language and patriarchal religion have erased women from history and made them non-beings and that biblical religion and theology is sexist to the core, like many feminists today she could not quite bring herself to the ultimate radical position.<sup>54</sup> It is easy to speculate that if she were alive today she would find a point of reference in the escalating and controversial liberation theology movement currently sweeping the Third World. Clearly, Lillian Smith would have favored a continually expanding definition of humanity--inclusive of both genders, all social groups and races. She would have been philosophically opposed to any principle of religion which marginalizes one group of persons as less than fully human.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978), p. 1. Despite the works of such scholars as J. J. Bachofen, *Myth, Religion and Mother Right*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton, J.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967); Lewis Henry Morgan, *League of the Iroquois* (New York: Corinth, 1962 [1851]); and Robert Briffault, *The Mother: A Study of the Origin of Sentiments and Institutions* (New York: Macmillan, 192 [1927]), whose theses support the idea of an ancient primacy of mother right, most anthropologists argue that male primacy is a pan-cultural

fact. Classic examples of such scholarship are Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex, Culture, and Myth* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1962); and Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structure of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969).

<sup>2</sup>Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem of Modern Democracy*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1944, 1962). For an interesting theory on the origin of woman's subordination, see Marvin Harris' *Cannibals and Kings: The Origins of Cultures* (New York: Random House, 1977) and *Cows, Pigs, Wars and Witches: The Riddles of Culture* (New York: Random House, 1974); see also his *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture* (New York: Random House, 1979), especially pages 46-114. Of course for the classic Marxian analysis of woman's subordination see Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, the State and Private Property* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1958).

<sup>3</sup>Eva Figs, *Patriarchal Attitudes: The Case for Women in Revolt* (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1970), p. 38. For a fascinating discussion on the subject of race and religion see William P. Jones, *Is God a White Racist?: A Preamble to Black Theology* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973).

<sup>4</sup>Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (New York: Praeger, 1966), pp. 141-142.

<sup>5</sup>Wilbur J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1941), p. 89.

<sup>6</sup>Rosemary Radford Reuther, ed., *Religion and Sexism: Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), p. 9.

<sup>7</sup>Robert Bellah, *Beyond Reality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970) p. 21.

<sup>8</sup>Gregory Baum, *Religion and Alienation* (New York: Paulist Press, 1975), p. 231.

<sup>9</sup>Phyllis Bird, "Images of Woman in the Old Testament," in *Religion and Sexism*, ed. Rosemary Radford Reuther (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), p. 41.

<sup>10</sup>Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House, 1979), p. 48.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 49-50, 57.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 41, 42, 47.

<sup>14</sup>Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of*



*Women's Liberation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), p. 2.

<sup>15</sup>George Hegel, *Early Theological Writings*, trans, T. M. Knox and R. Kroner (New York: Harper and Row, 1948). For an analysis of Hegel's thoughts on the subject see Gregory Baum, *Religion and Alienation*, pp. 7-9.

<sup>16</sup>Gregory Baum, *Religion and Alienation*, pp. 7-9. One theologian has remarked that Christianity is a biblical religion, that it is a "religion of a book" or rather a religion of various books if you will, for that is what the word "bible" means. Thus, theology can't swerve from its path in this respect. Because of its dependence on a book, Christian theology does not assert its independence from the past or from the sciences which help it understand the past, e.g., general history, the study of ancient languages and cultures, the history of biblical form, and the history of biblical redaction. Rather, "theology does implicitly or explicitly assert its independence from the sciences that deal with the present." See Juan Luis Segundo, *Liberation Theology*, trans, John Drury (Mary Knoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1976), p. 7.

<sup>17</sup>Lillian Smith, *Killers of the Dream*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1949, 1961), p. 116.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 86.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 87-89.

<sup>24</sup>"Humans in Bondage," *Social Action* (February 13, 1944): 6-34.

<sup>25</sup>*Killers of the Dream*, p. 90.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

<sup>29</sup>"Humans in Bondage," *Social Action* (February 15, 1944): 6-34.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans, H. J. Parshly (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1952; Bantam Books, 1961), p. 565.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 385. For an excellent but anti-feminist analysis of women and the patriarchy see Juliet Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974).

<sup>37</sup>See Lillian Smith's analysis of the socio-economic function of religion in "Two Men and a Bargain," in *Killers of the Dream*, pp. 175-190.

<sup>38</sup>*Killers of the Dream*, p. 118.

<sup>39</sup>Richard H. King, *A Southern Renaissance: The Cultural Awakening of the American South 1930-1953* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 20-30. Also see Carl Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

<sup>40</sup>King, *A Southern Renaissance*, p. 27.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>43</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, pp. 56, 565-566. See also Carolyn G. Heilbrun, *Reinventing Womanhood* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1979), p. 44. Heilbrun discusses such women as Phyllis Schlafly, who although having found fulfillment in professional activities herself, preaches the gospel of female subordination. For a different point of view see Ann Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics 1830-1930* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970). A classic example of blaming the victim can be seen in Hannah Arendt's interpretation of antisemitism, in *The Origin of Totalitarianism* and essays such as "Jew as Pariah" and "Privileged Jews." Two recent examples of the "idea of the responsible victim" are Thomas Sowell, *Ethnic America: A History* (New York: Basic Books, 1981) and Anne Wortham, *The Other Side of Racism: A Philosophical Study of Black Race Consciousness* (Ohio State University Press, 1981).

<sup>44</sup>Lillian Smith, "Man Born of Woman," *North Georgia Review*, 6 (Winter 1941): 12.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Marvin Harris, *Cannibals and Kings: The Origins of Cultures* (New York: Random House, 1977).

<sup>48</sup>*Killers of the Dream*, p. 149.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 151.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 153.

<sup>51</sup>Richard King, *A Southern Renaissance*, p. 189.



<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>For an excellent analysis of the debate, see Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *Faith, Feminism, and the Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983). See also Carol Christ and Judith Plascow, *Woman-spirit Rising* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979). For examples of feminist theology, see Rosemary Radford Reuther and Eleanor McLaughlin, eds., *Women of Spirit* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979); Rosemary Radford Reuther, (ed.), *Religion and Sexism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, Touchstone Books, 1974); Rosemary Radford Reuther, *New Woman and New Earth* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975); Letty Russell, *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective--A Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974); Marianne H. Micks, *Our Search for Identity: Humanity in the Image of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Rosemary Radford Reuther, *Sexism and God Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983).

<sup>54</sup>Good examples of the radical feminist position are Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973) and Gyn/Ecology (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978); Naomi Goldenberg, *The Changing of the Gods* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979).