Betty Friedan (born 1921) used the post-graduation experiences of her former college classmates to write about the dissatisfaction of many American housewives. An immediate bestseller, *The Feminine Mystique* launched a resurgence of women’s rights activism among middle-class white women, a group that had been politically passive since achieving the right for women to vote. Friedan helped found the National Organization for Women (NOW) in 1966 and became its first president.

**THINK THROUGH HISTORY:** Analyzing Issues
According to Friedan, what were some of the conditions that created “the problem that has no name”? Do you think these issues have been resolved, or are they still present in American society today? Explain.

...If a woman had a problem in the 1950s and 1960s, she knew that something must be wrong with her marriage, or with herself. Other women were satisfied with their lives, she thought. What kind of a woman was she if she did not feel this mysterious fulfillment waxing the kitchen floor? She was so ashamed to admit her dissatisfaction that she never knew how many other women shared it. If she tried to tell her husband, he didn’t understand what she was talking about. She did not really understand it herself. For over fifteen years women in America found it harder to talk about this problem than about sex. Even the psychoanalysts had no name for it. When a woman went to a psychiatrist for help, as many women did, she would say, “I’m so ashamed,” or “I must be hopelessly neurotic.” “I don’t know what’s wrong with women today,” a suburban psychiatrist said uneasily. “I only know something is wrong because most of my patients happen to be women. And their problem isn’t sexual.” Most women with this problem did not go to see a psychoanalyst, however. “There’s nothing wrong really,” they kept telling themselves. “There isn’t any problem.”

But on an April morning in 1959, I heard a mother of four, having coffee with four other mothers in a suburban development fifteen miles from New York, say in a tone of quiet desperation, “the problem.” And the others knew, without words, that she was not talking about a problem with her husband, or her children, or her home. Suddenly they realized they all shared the same problem, the problem that has no name. They began, hesitantly, to talk about it. Later,
after they had picked up their children at nursery school and taken them home to
nap, two of the women cried, in sheer relief, just to know they were not alone.

Gradually I came to realize that the problem that has no name was shared by
countless women in America. As a magazine writer I often interviewed women
about problems with their children, or their marriages, or their houses, or their
communities. But after a while I began to recognize the telltale signs of this other
problem. I saw the same signs in suburban ranch houses and split-levels on Long
Island and in New Jersey and Westchester County; in colonial houses in a small
Massachusetts town; on patios in Memphis; in suburban and city apartments; in
living rooms in the Midwest. Sometimes I sensed the problem, not as a reporter,
but as a suburban housewife, for during this time I was also bringing up my own
three children in Rockland County, New York. I heard echoes of the problem in
college dormitories and semi-private maternity wards, at PTA meetings and
luncheons of the League of Women Voters, at suburban cocktail parties, in station
wagons waiting for trains, and in snatches of conversation overheard at Schrafft’s.
The groping words I heard from other women, on quiet afternoons when children
were at school or on quiet evenings when husbands worked late, I think I
understood first as a woman long before I understood their larger social and
psychological implications.

Just what was this problem that has no name? What were the words women
used when they tried to express it? Sometimes a woman would say “I feel empty
somehow...incomplete.” Or she would say, “I feel as if I don’t exist.” Sometimes
she blotted out the feeling with a tranquilizer. Sometimes she thought the problem
was with her husband, or her children, or that what she really needed was to
redecorate her house, or move to a better neighborhood, or have an affair, or
another baby. Sometimes, she went to a doctor with symptoms she could hardly
describe: “A tired feeling...I get so angry with the children it scares me...I feel like
crying without any reason.” (A Cleveland doctor called it “the housewife’s
syndrome.”) A number of women told me about great bleeding blisters that break
out on their hands and arms. “I call it the housewife’s blight,” said a family doctor
in Pennsylvania. “I see it so often lately in these young women with four, five and
six children who bury themselves in their dishpans. But it isn’t caused by detergent
and it isn’t cured by cortisone.”

Sometimes a woman would tell me that the feeling gets so strong she runs out
of the house and walks through the streets. Or she stays inside her house and cries.
Or her children tell her a joke, and she doesn’t laugh because she doesn’t hear it.
I talked to women who had spent years on the analyst’s couch, working out their
“adjustment to the feminine role,” their blocks to “fulfillment as a wife and
mother.” But the desperate tone in these women’s voices, and the look in their
eyes, was the same as the tone and the look of other women, who were sure they
had no problem, even though they did have a strange feeling of desperation.
A mother of four who left college at nineteen to get married told me:

I’ve tried everything women are supposed to do—hobbies, gardening, pickling, canning, being very social with my neighbors, joining committees, running PTA teas. I can do it all, and I like it, but it doesn’t leave you anything to think about—any feeling of who you are. I never had any career ambitions. All I wanted was to get married and have four children. I love the kids and Bob and my home. There’s no problem you can even put a name to. But I’m desperate. I begin to feel I have no personality. I’m a server of food and a putter-on of pants and a bedmaker, somebody who can be called on when you want something. But who am I?

A twenty-three-year-old mother in blue jeans said:

I ask myself why I’m so dissatisfied. I’ve got my health, fine children, a lovely new home, enough money. My husband has a real future as an electronics engineer. He doesn’t have any of these feelings. He says maybe I need a vacation, let’s go to New York for a weekend. But that isn’t it. I always had this idea we should do everything together. I can’t sit down and read a book alone. If the children are napping and I have one hour to myself I just walk through the house waiting for them to wake up. I don’t make a move until I know where the rest of the crowd is going. It’s as if ever since you were a little girl, there’s always been somebody or something that will take care of your life: your parents, or college, or falling in love, or having a child, or moving to a new house. Then you wake up one morning and there’s nothing to look forward to.

A young wife in a Long Island development said:

I seem to sleep so much. I don’t know why I should be so tired. This house isn’t nearly so hard to clean as the cold-water flat we had when I was working. The children are at school all day. It’s not the work. I just don’t feel alive.

In 1960, the problem that has no name burst like a boil through the image of the happy American housewife. In the television commercials the pretty housewives still beamed over their foaming dishpans and Time’s cover story on “The Suburban Wife, an American Phenomenon” protested: “Having too good a time...to believe that they should be unhappy.” But the actual unhappiness of the American housewife was suddenly being reported—from the New York Times and Newsweek to Good Housekeeping and CBS Television (“The Trapped Housewife”), although almost everybody who talked about it found some superficial reason to dismiss it. It was attributed to incompetent appliance repairmen (New York Times), or the distances children must be chauffeured in the suburbs (Time), or too much PTA (Redbook). Some said it was the old problem—education: more and more women had education, which naturally made them unhappy in their role as housewives. “The road from Freud to Frigidaire, from Sophocles to Spock, has turned out to be a bumpy one,” reported the New York Times (June 28, 1960). “Many young women—certainly not all—whose education plunged them into a world of ideas feel stifled in their homes.
They find their routine lives out of joint with their training. Like shut-ins, they feel left out. In the last year, the problem of the educated housewife has provided the meat of dozens of speeches made by troubled presidents of women's colleges who maintain, in the face of complaints, that sixteen years of academic training is realistic preparation for wifehood and motherhood."

The year American women's discontent boiled over, it was also reported (Look) that the more than 21,000,000 American women who are single, widowed, or divorced do not cease even after fifty their frenzied, desperate search for a man. And the search begins early—for seventy per cent of all American women now marry before they are twenty-four. A pretty twenty-five-year-old secretary took thirty-five different jobs in six months in the futile hope of finding a husband. Women were moving from one political club to another, taking evening courses in accounting or sailing, learning to play golf or ski, joining a number of churches in succession, going to bars alone, in their ceaseless search for a man.

Of the growing thousands of women currently getting private psychiatric help in the United States, the married ones were reported dissatisfied with their marriages, the unmarried ones suffering from anxiety and, finally, depression. Strangely, a number of psychiatrists stated that, in their experience, unmarried women patients were happier than married ones. So the door of all those pretty suburban houses opened a crack to permit a glimpse of uncounted thousands of American housewives who suffered alone from a problem that suddenly everyone was talking about, and beginning to take for granted, as one of those unreal problems in American life that can never be solved—like the hydrogen bomb. By 1962 the plight of the trapped American housewife had become a national parlor game. Whole issues of magazines, newspaper columns, books learned and frivolous, educational conferences and television panels were devoted to the problem....

It is no longer possible to ignore that voice, to dismiss the desperation of so many American women. This is not what being a woman means, no matter what the experts say. For human suffering there is a reason; perhaps the reason has not been found because the right questions have not been asked, or pressed far enough. I do not accept the answer that there is no problem because American women have luxuries that women in other times and lands never dreamed of; part of the strange newness of the problem is that it cannot be understood in terms of the age-old material problems of man: poverty, sickness, hunger, cold. The women who suffer this problem have a hunger that food cannot fill. It persists in women whose husbands are struggling internes and law clerks, or prosperous doctors and lawyers; in wives of workers and executives who make $5,000 a year or $50,000. It is not caused by lack of material advantages; it may not even be felt by women preoccupied with desperate problems of hunger, poverty or illness. And women who think it will be solved by more money, a bigger house, a second car, moving to a better suburb, often discover it gets worse....

If I am right, the problem that has no name stirring in the minds of so many American women today is not a matter of loss of femininity or too much
education, or the demands of domesticity. It is far more important than anyone recognizes. It is the key to these other new and old problems which have been torturing women and their husbands and children, and puzzling their doctors and educators for years. It may well be the key to our future as a nation and a culture.

We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: “I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.”

THINK THROUGH HISTORY: ANSWER
Students may answer that Friedan defines “the problem that has no name” as married women feeling unfulfilled in their roles as housewives and mothers. Students may cite two related conditions as being the cause of the problem: society’s expectation that women will be content in their role as housewives, and the limited career opportunities available to women. Students may answer that these issues have been resolved since the first edition of The Feminine Mystique in 1963, as changes in laws and social customs have opened many paths for women to pursue careers. Other students may argue that these issues have not been entirely resolved by the opening of professional opportunities to women. They may say that women are still expected to fill the roles of housewives and primary caretaker for children, even if they have demanding careers.