

Durée : 6 heures

Analysez et commentez, **en anglais**, les documents suivants :

**Document n°1: Florence Nightingale, *Notes On Nursing, What it is, and What it is Not*, London, Harrison, 1860, pp. 131-133.**

1 To sum up: – the answer to two of the commonest objections urged, one by women themselves, the other by men, against the desirableness of sanitary knowledge for women plus a caution, comprises the whole argument for the art of nursing.

5 (1). It is often said by men, that it is unwise to teach women anything about these laws of health, because they will take to physicking,—that there is a great deal too much of amateur physicking as it is, which is indeed true. (...). But this is just what the really experienced and observing nurse does not do; she neither physics herself nor others. (...)

10 (2). It is often said by women, that they cannot know anything of the laws of health, or what to do to preserve their children's health, because they can know nothing of "Pathology," or cannot "dissect,"—a confusion of ideas which it is hard to attempt to disentangle. (...). Neither [medicine nor surgery] can do anything but remove obstructions; neither can cure; nature alone cures. (...) And what nursing has to do in either case, is to put the patient in the best condition for nature to act upon him. (...)

Now for the caution:

15 (3.) It seems a commonly received idea among men and even among women themselves that it requires nothing but a disappointment in love, the want of an object, a general disgust, or incapacity for other things, to turn a woman into a good nurse. (...)

20 Yet popular novelists of recent days have invented ladies disappointed in love or fresh out of the drawing-room turning into the war-hospitals to find their wounded lovers, and when found, forthwith abandoning their sick-ward for their lover, as might be expected. Yet in the estimation of the authors, these ladies were none the worse for that, but on the contrary were heroines of nursing. What cruel mistakes are sometimes made by benevolent men and women in matters of business about which they can know nothing and think they know a great deal.

25 The everyday management of a large ward, let alone of a hospital—the knowing what are the laws of life and death for men, and what the laws of health for wards—(and wards are healthy or unhealthy, mainly according to the knowledge or ignorance of the nurse)—are not these matters of sufficient importance and difficulty to require learning by experience and careful inquiry, just as much as any other art? They do not come by inspiration to the lady disappointed in love, nor to the poor workhouse drudge hard up for a livelihood. And terrible  
30 is the injury which has followed to the sick from such wild notions! (...)

It is true we make "no vows." But is a "vow" necessary to convince us that the true spirit for learning any art, most especially an art of charity, aright, is not a disgust to everything or something else? Do we really place the love of our kind (and of nursing, as one branch of it) so low as this? (...)

35 NOTE.—I would earnestly ask my sisters to keep clear of both the jargons now current everywhere (for they are equally jargons); of the jargon, namely, about the "rights" of women, which urges women to do all that men do, including the medical and other professions,

merely because men do it, and without regard to whether this is the best that women can do; and of the jargon which urges women to do nothing that men do, merely because they are  
40 women, and should be "recalled to a sense of their duty as women," and because "this is women's work," and "that is men's," and "these are things which women should not do," which is all assertion, and nothing more. Surely woman should bring the best she has, whatever that is, to the work of God's world, without attending to either of these cries. For what are they, both of them, the one just as much as the other, but listening to the "what  
45 people will say," to opinion, to the "voices from without?" And as a wise man has said, no one has ever done anything great or useful by listening to the voices from without.

You do not want the effect of your good things to be, "How wonderful for a woman!" nor would you be deterred from good things by hearing it said, "Yes, but she ought not to have done this, because it is not suitable for a woman." But you want to do the thing that is good,  
50 whether it is "suitable for a woman" or not.

It does not make a thing good, that it is remarkable that a woman should have been able to do it. Neither does it make a thing bad, which would have been good had a man done it, that it has been done by a woman.

Oh, leave these jargons, and go your way straight to God's work, in simplicity and singleness  
55 of heart.

1 America claims more civilization than any other nation on earth. In the main this is so.  
But certainly she is not true to the motherhood, and *this is her peril*. Some of the best  
reigns have been those of queens. All nations have had their women rulers, but the  
5 mothers of America are not allowed to say who shall be the ones to help them make  
good citizens of their own children, while their bitter foes prey upon their offspring as  
cannibals. A widow with six sons has a little home. She is taxed the same in  
proportion as the brewer, who carries on the human butcher-shop that grinds up the six  
10 sons of the widow. He and his crowd (republicans and democrats) have the ballot that  
smashes the poor widow's boys and takes her substance to prosecute her boys after  
they are made criminals, to pay for their arrest, to build a jail for them. Her heart is  
broken, home is gone, and disgrace is hers. To accomplish this she is rendered  
helpless by having no voice or ballot to protect herself. God never made an animal that  
15 he did not give it some means of defense. While I am writing this I am in Bridgeport,  
Connecticut. I find this a city of eighty-two thousand. The *president of the board of  
education* is P. W. Wren, who is president of the Connecticut Breweries and owner of  
one of the largest wholesale whiskey houses in the state. This is as consistent as if one  
were to start a ranch to raise chickens, ducks, pigs and calves and then place a wolf to  
20 guard them from harm. The business of the brewer is to sell beer. No animal but  
mankind will use this rotten slop, for the others by instinct know it is poison. No man  
would let his horses drink it, for they would be dangerous instead of being useful. The  
only way to make the brewer's business profitable is to have boys and girls as  
consumers. The brewer is not the worst to blame. It is the voter. Mothers would never  
25 vote for such a man to be the public guardian of the morals of their children. All liquor  
men, or liquor license men, are opposed to woman's suffrage, for the reason that  
should women vote, we would have prohibition or abolition of the vice. The women  
saved prohibition in Topeka in the year 1903 by five hundred majority, while it would  
have been lost by two hundred if men only had voted. The contest was between the  
30 *wet* and *dry* mayors. Where women have the ballot, even in municipal affairs, no state  
has resubmitted or brought back the saloon. God said: "It is not good for man to be  
alone. I will make him a helpmate, a partner, a companion, a guardian." When man  
elevates a woman he elevates himself. A degraded woman means many degraded men.  
Free men must be the sons of free women. This land cannot be the land of the free or  
home of the brave, until woman gets her freedom and men are brave and just to award  
35 it to her. No man can have the true impulse of liberty and want his mother to be a  
slave.

The constitution of the United States starts out by saying. "We, the people of the  
United States." Women are people as well as men. Therefore I advise all women to go  
40 to the polls and vote in spring and fall elections. We want the moral, intellectual  
electorate. The brewer, distiller, saloon man, their agents, even the colored man was  
given a vote, and never asked for it. The foreigners in a few months, or a year, after  
landing, are given the ballot, but the loving, true defenders of God, home and all the  
best interests of humanity, are compelled to see their sons, husbands, and fathers,  
murdered before their eyes, without the sign of a protest from the government under  
which they live. The outrageous unfairness of this is quite evident when we consider

45       that the ballot is represented and controlled by the worst element, when it should be by the best. The women are more affected by oppression than man. She is the mother, the rest are the children.

The mother would vote to save the boy.

The mother would do nothing to injure her boy.

50       The mother makes a good citizen of her son.

The saloon man votes to make drunkards.

The saloon man does all to injure.

The saloon man makes bad citizens.

55       The best voters are cast out for President, the vilest are put in, no wonder we have a snob and brewers choice.

60       A boy's best friend is his mother. Boys and girls go wrong when they do not obey their mothers. God has always used women as a mighty factor in salvation. The promise was given her in the garden, after the fall, that she should produce the Savior, who would give the deadly wound to man's great enemy, the devil. It was the "seed of the woman," not the seed of the man. Christ was born of a woman and the Holy Ghost.

**Document n°3: Woman Suffrage, by Emma Goldman (*Anarchism and Other Essays*. Second Revised Edition. New York & London: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1911, pp. 201-217).**

1 We boast of the age of advancement, of science, and progress. Is it not strange, then, that we  
still believe in fetish worship? (...) Woman, even more than man, is a fetish worshipper, and  
though her idols may change, she is ever on her knees, ever holding up her hands, ever blind  
to the fact that her god has feet of clay. Thus woman has been the greatest supporter of all  
5 deities from time immemorial. Thus, too, she has had to pay the price that only gods can  
exact,--her freedom, her heart's blood, her very life. (...)

Religion, especially the Christian religion, has condemned woman to the life of an inferior, a  
slave. It has thwarted her nature and fettered her soul, yet the Christian religion has no greater  
supporter, none more devout, than woman. Indeed, it is safe to say that religion would have  
10 long ceased to be a factor in the lives of the people, if it were not for the support it receives  
from woman. The most ardent church workers, the most tireless missionaries the world over,  
are women, always sacrificing on the altar of the gods that have chained her spirit and  
enslaved her body.

The insatiable monster, war, robs woman of all that is dear and precious to her. It exacts her  
15 brothers, lovers, sons, and in return gives her a life of loneliness and despair. Yet the greatest  
supporter and worshiper of war is woman. She it is who instills the love of conquest and  
power into her children; she it is who whispers the glories of war into the ears of her little  
ones, and who rocks her baby to sleep with the tunes of trumpets and the noise of guns. It is  
woman, too, who crowns the victor on his return from the battlefield. Yes, it is woman who  
20 pays the highest price to that insatiable monster, war.

Then there is the home. What a terrible fetish it is! How it saps the very life-energy of  
woman,--this modern prison with golden bars. Its shining aspect blinds woman to the price  
she would have to pay as wife, mother, and housekeeper. Yet woman clings tenaciously to the  
home, to the power that holds her in bondage. (...)

25 What wonder, then, that she should be just as devout, just as zealous, just as prostrate before  
the new idol, woman suffrage. (...) Woman's demand for equal suffrage is based largely on

the contention that woman must have the equal right in all affairs of society. No one could, possibly, refute that, if suffrage were a right. Alas, for the ignorance of the human mind, which can see a right in an imposition. Or is it not the most brutal imposition for one set of  
30 people to make laws that another set is coerced by force to obey? Yet woman clamors for that “golden opportunity” that has wrought so much misery in the world, and robbed man of his integrity and self-reliance; an imposition which has thoroughly corrupted the people, and made them absolute prey in the hands of unscrupulous politicians.

The poor, stupid, free American citizen! Free to starve, free to tramp the highways of this  
35 great country, he enjoys universal suffrage, and, by that right, he has forged chains about his limbs. The reward that he receives is stringent labor laws prohibiting the right of boycott, of picketing, in fact, of everything, except the right to be robbed of the fruits of his labor. Yet all these disastrous results of the twentieth century fetish have taught woman nothing. (...). Since woman's greatest misfortune has been that she was looked upon as either angel or devil, her  
40 true salvation lies in being placed on earth; namely, in being considered human, and therefore subject to all human follies and mistakes. Are we, then, to believe that two errors will make a right? Are we to assume that the poison already inherent in politics will be decreased, if women were to enter the political arena? The most ardent suffragists would hardly maintain such a folly. (...)

45 True, in the suffrage States women are guaranteed equal rights to property; but of what avail is that right to the mass of women without property, the thousands of wage workers, who live from hand to mouth? (...)

Woman demands the same rights as man, yet she is indignant that her presence does not strike him dead: he smokes, keeps his hat on, and does not jump from his seat like a flunkey. These  
50 may be trivial things, but they are nevertheless the key to the nature of American suffragists. (...) The American suffrage movement has been, until very recently, altogether a parlor affair, absolutely detached from the economic needs of the people. Thus Susan B. Anthony, no doubt an exceptional type of woman, was not only indifferent but antagonistic to labor; nor did she hesitate to manifest her antagonism when, in 1869, she advised women to take the  
55 places of striking printers in New York. I do not know whether her attitude had changed before her death.

There are, of course, some suffragists who are affiliated with workingwomen—the Women's Trade Union League, for instance; but they are a small minority, and their activities are essentially economic. The rest look upon toil as a just provision of Providence. What would  
60 become of the rich, if not for the poor? What would become of these idle, parasitic ladies, who squander more in a week than their victims earn in a year, if not for the eighty million wage workers? Equality, who ever heard of such a thing? (...)

One of the great American women leaders claims that woman is entitled not only to equal pay, but that she ought to be legally entitled even to the pay of her husband. Failing to support  
65 her, he should be put in convict stripes, and his earnings in prison be collected by his equal wife. (...)

Nothing is so dangerous as the dissection of a fetish. If we have outlived the time when such heresy was punishable at the stake, we have not outlived the narrow spirit of condemnation of those who dare differ with accepted notions. (...)

70 Yes, I may be considered an enemy of woman; but if I can help her see the light, I shall not complain. (...) Her development, her freedom, her independence, must come from and through herself. First, by asserting herself as a personality, and not as a sex commodity. Second, by refusing the right to anyone over her body; by refusing to bear children, unless she wants them; by refusing to be a servant to God, the State, society, the husband, the family,  
75 etc.; by making her life simpler, but deeper and richer. That is, by trying to learn the meaning and substance of life in all its complexities, by freeing herself from the fear of public opinion and public condemnation. Only that, and not the ballot, will set woman free, will make her a force hitherto unknown in the world, a force for real love, for peace, for harmony; a force of divine fire, of life giving; a creator of free men and women.

**Document n°4: *Three guineas*, by Virginia Woolf, part II, London, 1938.**

1 ‘(...) Such being the answer of the oracle, such are the conditions attached to this guinea. You shall have it, to recapitulate, on condition that you help all properly qualified people, of whatever sex, class or colour, to enter your profession; and further on condition that in the practice of your profession you refuse to be separated from poverty, chastity, derision and  
5 freedom from unreal loyalties. (...). By poverty is meant enough money to live upon. That is, you must earn enough to be independent of any other human being and to buy that modicum of health, leisure, knowledge and so on that is needed for the full development of body and mind. But no more. Not a penny more.

‘By chastity is meant that when you have made enough to live on by your profession you  
10 must refuse to sell your brain for the sake of money. That is you must cease to practise your profession, or practise it for the sake of research and experiment; or, if you are an artist, for the sake of the art; or give the knowledge acquired professionally to those who need it for nothing. (...)

‘By derision—a bad word, but once again the English language is much in need of new  
15 words—is meant that you must refuse all methods of advertising merit, and hold that ridicule, obscurity and censure are preferable, for psychological reasons, to fame and praise. Directly badges, orders, or degrees are offered you, fling them back in the giver’s face.

‘By freedom from unreal loyalties is meant that you must rid yourself of pride and nationality in the first place; also of religious pride, college pride, school pride, family pride, sex pride  
20 and those unreal loyalties that spring from them. Directly the seducers come with their seductions to bribe you into captivity, tear up the parchments; refuse to fill up the forms.

‘For the rest, though the conditions may seem many and the guinea, alas, is single, they are not for the most part as things are at present very difficult of fulfilment. With the exception of the first—that we must earn enough money to live upon—they are largely ensured us by the  
25 laws of England. The law of England sees to it that we do not inherit great possessions; the law of England denies us, and let us hope will long continue to deny us, the full stigma of nationality. Then we can scarcely doubt that our brothers will provide us for many centuries to come, as they have done for many centuries past, with what is so essential for sanity, and so invaluable in preventing the great modern sins of vanity, egotism, megalomania—that is to  
30 say ridicule, censure and contempt. And so long as the Church of England refuses our



services—long may she exclude us!—and the ancient schools and colleges refuse to admit us to a share of their endowments and privileges we shall be immune without any trouble on our part from the particular loyalties and fealties which such endowments and privileges engender. Further, Madam, the traditions of the private house, that ancestral memory which  
35 lies behind the present moment, are there to help you. (...) Then again, are we not greatly fortified in resisting the seductions of the most powerful of all seducers—money—by those same traditions? For how many centuries have we not enjoyed the right of working all day and every day for £40 a year with board and lodging thrown in? (...) Finally, honour, fame, consequence—is it not easy for us to resist that seduction, we who have worked for centuries  
40 without other honour than that which is reflected from the coronets and badges on our father's or husband's brows and breasts?

‘Thus, with law on our side, and property on our side, and ancestral memory to guide us, there is no need of further argument; you will agree that the conditions upon which this guinea is yours are, with the exception of the first, comparatively easy to fulfil. (...) For if you agree to  
45 these terms then you can join the professions and yet remain uncontaminated by them; you can rid them of their possessiveness, their jealousy, their pugnacity, their greed. You can use them to have a mind of your own and a will of your own. And you can use that mind and will to abolish the inhumanity, the beastliness, the horror, the folly of war. Take this guinea then and use it, not to burn the house down, but to make its windows blaze. And let the daughters  
50 of uneducated women dance round the new house, the poor house, the house that stands in a narrow street where omnibuses pass and the street hawkers cry their wares, and let them sing, “We have done with war! We have done with tyranny!” And their mothers will laugh from their graves, “It was for this that we suffered obloquy and contempt! Light up the windows of the new house, daughters! Let them blaze!”

55 ‘Those then are the terms upon which I give you this guinea with which to help the daughters of uneducated women to enter the professions. And by cutting short the peroration let us hope that you will be able to give the finishing touches to your bazaar, arrange the hare and the coffee-pot, and receive the Right Honourable Sir Sampson Legend, O.M., K.C.B., LL.D., D.C.L., P.C., etc., with that air of smiling deference which befits the daughter of an educated  
60 man in the presence of her brother.’

Such then, Sir, was the letter finally sent to the honorary treasurer of the society for helping the daughters of educated men to enter the professions.

**Document n°5: "Old Law Shielding a Woman's Virtue Faces an Updating", by Sarah Kershaw, *New York Times*, January 26, 2005**

1 SEATTLE, Jan. 25 - It is about time, politicians here are saying, for the state of Washington to catch up with the rest of the world.

Florida has struck down a law forbidding unmarried women from parachuting on Sundays. Michigan has done away with a law making it illegal to swear in front of women and children.  
5 Texas women no longer face 12 months in prison for adjusting their stockings in public. And the ladies of Maine can now legally tickle a man under the chin with a feather duster.

But here in Washington, in 2005, it is still illegal, under a 1909 law, to bring a woman's virtue into question publicly, to call her a hussy or a strumpet.

10 And now, a state senator from Seattle - who is not saying she supports attacking the chastity of Washington women - is, nevertheless, trying to overturn the state's "Slander of a Woman" law.

The law was enacted here at a time when women could not vote, when they were viewed by society as delicate flowers to be kept in the kitchen, tending to wood-burning stoves for their genteel gentlemen, vulnerable maidens in need of legal protection from verbal assaults on  
15 their purity. It was upheld by the State Supreme Court in 1914, which researchers say was apparently the last time it was before the courts.

Now, Senate Bill 5148, introduced this month by Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles, a Democrat, would repeal the law, which makes it a misdemeanor to slander any female older than 12 - other than prostitutes - by uttering "any false or defamatory words or language which shall  
20 injure or impair the reputation of any such female for virtue or chastity or which shall expose her to hatred, contempt or ridicule."

If the bill becomes law, women will have the same protection as men under the other slander laws, which will remain in effect.

25 Ms. Kohl-Welles - who lectures on women's studies at the University of Washington and admits there are more pressing priorities facing a state with a \$1.8 billion deficit - said the old law was nonetheless a vestige of sexism, a "double standard" and an unconstitutional affront to free speech.

"Even though one type of treatment can appear on the surface to be positive and complimentary, it's also being protective and patronizing," said Ms. Kohl-Welles, who has  
30 researched other old-fashioned laws and found that many states have done away with them.

But Washington women are not the only ones who have such legal protections against dastardly assaults on their integrity. Eight other states, including New York, still have similar laws on their books, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures, even if they have been rarely used since the days of horse drawn carriages.

- 35 Michigan is one of those states. But in 2002 an appeals court there did strike down a separate 105-year-old law that made it illegal to swear in front of women and children, after a man dubbed by local media the "cussing canoeist," was punished with a \$75 fine and ordered to perform four days of community service. His offense was uttering profanities in front of women and children in 1999, after he fell out of his canoe.
- 40 Here in Washington, where Republicans and Democrats are deeply divided over a contested governor's election, the bill to repeal the law against slandering a woman seems to have unusual support from both sides of the aisle, from both Venus and Mars, with three Democrats and one Republican, two men and two women, sponsoring the bill.
- 45 Ms. Kohl-Welles introduced the bill two years ago, but it died a fast death in the Republican-controlled Senate. This year, Democrats control both houses of the Legislature, and the head of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Adam Kline, is a Democrat and a cosponsor of the bill, leading to optimism that impugning a woman's virtue could become legal here.
- Mr. Kline said his interest in the bill was less about women's rights and more about purging the law books of anachronisms.
- 50 "This was a simply an attempt to get rid of an anomaly, something that was enacted in 1909," he said. "It's archaic. It has no business being in the law in the year 2005." While most of the nation's laws prohibiting impugning a woman's chastity have not been used for decades - or longer - New York's law was cited in a lawsuit filed in 1996 by a Harlem teacher against Joe Klein, author of the 1995 novel *Primary Colors*, and his publisher, Random House. The
- 55 teacher said she was the basis for a character that had a sexual relationship with a fictional Southern governor. She claimed a violation of New York State Civil Rights Law, Article 7, Section 77, relating to "action of slander of a woman imputing unchastity to her." The case was dismissed in 2003. (...)