EMBODIMENT, ELIMINATION, AND THE ROLE OF TOILETS IN STRUGGLES FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Judith Plaskow

> …at the end of the row one free toilet
> oozes from under its crooked door,
> while a row of weary women carrying packages and babies
> wait and wait and wait to do
> what only the dead find unnecessary.
>
> Marge Piercy, ''To the Pay Toilet''

Revaluing the body, and especially the female body, has been central to the feminist project. One need only think of the significance and success of *Our Bodies Ourselves* and its sequels to appreciate the extent to which reclaiming women's colonized body space has played a vital role in feminist theory and activism. In religious studies, feminists have written extensively about disparagement of the body and sexuality and identification of women with the body in Western thought. From Rosemary Radford Ruether's explorations of dualism in classical and Christian culture written in the early 1970s to Margaret Farley's *Just Love* published in 2006, historians, ethicists, theologians, and others have both critiqued influential canonical texts and attempted to formulate alternative, appreciative, and non-dualistic understandings of sexuality and human embodiment. It is interesting, therefore, that in forty years of feminist theorizing about the body, elimination as a fundamental aspect of body experience has been largely ignored. Foucault may be

right that for the last three centuries, ''sex has become something to say, and to say exhaustively,'' but excretion seems to be consigned to the shadows.[1] In the words of Norman O. Brown, ''Repression weighs more heavily on anality than genitality.''[2]

In this essay, I seek to remedy the neglect of elimination by outlining a new project on embodiment, elimination, and the role of toilets in struggles for social justice. The project has two strands that are deeply interconnected. The first looks at the ways in which access to toilets is a prerequisite for full public participation and citizenship. The distribution, quality, and structure of public toilets are both symbols and concrete representations of a larger system of social hierarchies. Almost all the social justice movements of the last century in the United States have included struggles for adequate toilet facilities as an at least implicit part of their agendas: the civil rights movement, feminism, disability rights, and rights for transgender persons. In addition, an absence of toilets is a major problem for homeless persons and is a pressing health issue in the two-thirds world. How does looking at toilets help us to map power relations in our society and globally? What local battles have been fought over toilet equity? The second strand of the project involves reflecting on elimination as an aspect of human embodiment. Why the relative silence around this issue even among scholars who have written extensively about the body? What does our need for excretion say about us as embodied persons? How have attitudes and practices around excretion changed over time? What would it mean for feminists to reclaim excretion in the way we have reclaimed sexuality? What would sanitary facilities look like in a world in which people were both comfortable with this aspect of embodiment and committed to enabling a maximum number of persons to participate fully in public life?

The topic of toilets is intriguing partly because it provides a vehicle for exploring many intersecting issues: bathroom design and distribution can perpetuate a wide range of social inequalities, and bathroom activism has the potential to bring together very diverse interest groups.[3] In this paper, I will focus on some feminist issues surrounding bathrooms in the Western cultural context as an instance of the broader problem of toilets and social justice. Sometimes the absence of women's lavatories so clearly reflects the exclusion of women from public power and public space that it leaves one almost dumbfounded. There was no restroom

for women senators near the Senate floor, for example, until 1992, when the number of women in the Senate went from two to seven. Before then, Barbara Mikulski and Nancy Kassebaum either had to go up a floor to their offices or use the public restrooms downstairs. Women in the House of Representatives have a posh restroom. Unlike the men's room, however, which is just a few feet from the House chamber, it is accessed by traversing a hall where tourists gather or going through the minority leader's office and then winding down a long corridor.[4] On the one hand, separate Congressional restroom facilities themselves reflect the status and power differences between elected officials and constituents. On the other hand, as one recently elected Congresswoman put it, ''We're talking about the time it takes each of us to handle our business and get back to business.''[5] Not only does the absence of women's bathrooms signify the exclusion of women from certain professions and halls of power, but it also has functioned as an explicit argument against hiring women or admitting them into previously all-male organizations. Institutions as diverse as Yale Medical School, Harvard Law School, and the Bronx and Brooklyn Bar Associations have claimed that they were unable to let in women because no restroom facilities were available for them.[6] The Virginia Military Institute made the same argument as recently as 1996.[7]

These obvious and egregious examples of how a dearth of toilets reflects and perpetuates social inequality are on a continuum with the inconveniences and humiliations that many women experience every day. How many women have missed parts of meetings or events—or have stood with their legs crossed and breathing deeply—because they were on endless bathroom lines while men zipped in and out of men's rooms? Sometimes, especially in aging buildings, the discrepancy between male and female lavatory space seems to reflect deliberate discrimination. On the ballroom floor of the New York Hilton, for example, the women's room has four stalls while the adjoining men's room has six stalls and six urinals. Sometimes, women's and men's rooms are allotted equal floor space but, because urinals take up less room than stalls, men still have more fixtures. Other times, men's and women's rooms may even have an equal number of combined stalls and/or urinals, but this still fails to take account of the fact that women need *more* toilets than men for both social and physiological reasons.

Indeed, the question of what constitutes bathroom equity raises a central feminist issue: when does apparent equality constitute inequity because women's needs are different from those of men? Both cultural and physiological factors lead women to spend more time in the bathroom than men do. To start with, they take roughly twice as long to urinate. This is not because women preen themselves in front of mirrors as is sometimes claimed, but because closing a cubicle, adjusting clothing, sitting, using toilet paper, and then adjusting clothing again takes longer than standing at a urinal. Other cultural factors also extend women's bathroom time. Women often have primary responsibility for taking children to the toilet and may be called on to assist the elderly and disabled. Sometimes a taboo on breastfeeding in public places leads women to use toilets to breastfeed, an activity that takes significant time and reduces the number of available stalls. Moreover, there are many physical reasons why, on average, women use the toilet more frequently than men. About a quarter of adult women are menstruating at any given moment, which increases both their need for toilets and the time spent in a stall.[8] Urinary tract infections are twice as common in women as in men, with about 20 percent of women experiencing infection at some point in their lives. Interstitial cystitis, a chronic inflammation of the bladder wall, which, like urinary tract infections, increases both urinary frequency and the sense of urgency, is far more common in women. Pregnancy also contributes to women's need for more bathrooms: in early pregnancy, hormonal changes increase the need to urinate, while in late pregnancy, the uterus presses on the bladder, reducing its capacity. Urinary tract infections are also more common during pregnancy, and vaginal delivery can damage the pelvic floor muscles, leading to lifelong bladder problems. Thirty percent of women between the ages of fifteen and sixty-four may suffer from some form of urinary incontinence, as opposed to between 1.5 and 5 percent of men.[9]

Part of what I find intriguing and worthy of reflection in the fact that women daily confront built spaces based on the needs of healthy male bodies, is the extent to which women grumble about but also accept this reality, and the issue has *not* made it onto the feminist agenda. Women on long bathroom lines frequently complain and comment on the sad reality that men design bathrooms, but aside from occasionally storming a men's room when the situation becomes impossible,

we rarely *do* anything about it. We do not complain to management, boycott or picket institutions that have an insulting number of stalls, or organize letter-writing campaigns. Feminists have not systematically attended to built space as a reality that actively shapes identity and power relations in the way that we have attended to issues of language.[10] Just as language is not a neutral tool for communication but reflects and reinforces gender, race, and class inequalities, so those with the power to define a society's symbolic universe also have the power to create built worlds that represent and promulgate their beliefs and priorities. In the words of feminist architect Leslie Weisman, ''…the appropriation of space is a political act,…access to space is fundamentally related to social status and power, and…changing the allocation of space is inherently related to changing society.''[11]

I certainly do not want to deny the many local actions that have been fought on behalf of toilet equity. When I started graduate school at Yale, there were no women's bathrooms in the Divinity School Library; women had to go to a neighboring building to find a toilet. My first act as a feminist was to join with other female graduate students in taking over the men's room in the library stacks, planting flowers in the urinal, and proclaiming the facility unisex. As I have talked with people about bathroom allocation, I have heard many similar stories of protests at particular institutions, some including pee-ins or women going naked into the dean's office.[12] But what's interesting about these actions is that they need to be ferreted out. They are not an established part of feminist lore, viewed as successful local instances of a broader campaign of action. Numerous states have now passed so-called ''potty parity laws'' that require new or renovated buildings to provide women with equal access to bathroom space. While sometimes (as in the case of New York) these laws have been proposed by female legislators, in a number of cases they were proposed by men who were infuriated at having to wait ridiculous lengths of time for wives, girlfriends, and daughters to come out of public restrooms, and who, unlike the women, went and did something about it.[13]

Lack of sustained attention to bathroom equity constitutes a missed opportunity. This is an issue with potentially wide appeal that can serve as a starting point for understanding systemic inequalities of power and that is also a fruitful subject for feminist analysis. It provides an

excellent case study for exploring problems of equality and difference and whether equal protection under the law requires equal space, equal access, or equality of results.[14] Also, as bathrooms are one of the few gender-segregated spaces in our society that are largely taken for granted, they have a great deal to teach about the social construction of gender.[15] Toilet design and distribution both reflect and enforce cultural gender norms—a fact made clear, for example, by the presence of diaper changing tables in women's restrooms but not men's. Moreover, women's willingness to wait on line offers important insights into the process of female socialization. New York City Councilwoman Yvette Clark, who sponsored the Bathroom Equity Bill, points out that "There's a conditioning that happens to young women and children because people just accept [waiting in line for the bathroom] as just the way it is."[16] Beyond this, bathrooms provide a focus for exploring intersections among and conflicts and possible alliances between different social movements. Bathroom access has been a major issue for transgender activists whose need for bathroom space poses a challenge to continued gender segregation. Does such segregation serve any legitimate function? How can the desire of some women for the privacy and safety they associate with women-only space be reconciled with the need of transgender persons for safe and accessible restrooms?[17] How do the interests of transgender activists intersect with those of men accompanying female children or disabled women to the toilet, or of women aiding adult men?

It may be that the success of the anti-ERA movement in using the specter of unisex bathrooms as a wedge issue in fighting the Equal Rights Amendment has made feminists gun-shy about raising problems of bathroom access. But I suspect that avoidance of this issue is far more complexly over-determined, and is connected to the second strand of my project: namely attitudes toward embodiment. Our current negative attitudes toward excretion and the silence and embarrassment the topic evokes are the results of complex historical processes that involved both social-cultural and medical-scientific transformations. There was never a period in Western history when people were entirely unconcerned about waste. The biblical injunction to designate a place for defecation outside the (military) camp and to dig holes to cover up excrement reflects concerns about dirt and cleanliness that continue to shape attitudes toward elimination.[18] Yet at the same time, urination and defecation were for

many centuries publicly visible and taken-for-granted aspects of daily life in a way very different from today. In Medieval Europe, for example, there was not the same compulsion toward, or indeed, possibility of, privacy that is so important in contemporary society.[19] The smells and presence of excrement pervaded the environment: the walls of houses were stained with urine; people relieved themselves in the streets; latrines were everywhere, near doorways, stairs, and kitchens.[20] A sixteenth century European Court Regulation that adjures gentleman not to relieve themselves in front of ladies or before the doors and windows of court chambers suggests that an imperative toward shame developed gradually and in particular historical contexts.[21] In France, for instance, the second half of the eighteenth century saw a new sensitivity to smell that was linked to anxieties about the precariousness of organic life and a new interest in public sanitation policies.[22] In roughly the same period, a new set of understandings and practices around excretion emerged among the bourgeoisie that they used to differentiate themselves from the proletariat. While the bourgeoisie perceived the proletariat as dirty and disgusting, embedded in natural, bodily processes, they saw themselves as able to transcend the inferior natural world by denying and hiding the need for excretion. Increasing social pressure to make defecation private and invisible was correlated with a new reluctance even to speak about elimination and to use euphemisms when the subject could not be avoided altogether.[23] The availability of flush toilets at the end of the eighteenth century and the creation of large-scale sewer systems in the nineteenth allowed for the wider dissemination of this set of attitudes and for the radical disassociation of the self and its excreta characteristic of the contemporary period. The fact that, at the touch of a handle, we can have our urine and feces whisked away as if they never existed permits us to divorce ourselves from the messy, excreting body.[24]

Norbert Elias, in his magisterial two-volume work on *The Civilizing Process*, argues that ''growing up'' in Western society means being subjected on an individual level to a civilizing process analogous to one that took place in Europe over several hundred years.[25] As Freud points out, the desire to get rid of excreta is a learned response; it is not shared by children, who are often fascinated by feces and other secretions of their own bodies and who can get many different kinds of pleasure from them. It is toilet training that, in our earliest years, teaches us to repress

these feelings and to respond to feces with deep disgust and shame.[26] Elias suggests that the degree of instinctual control expected of adults in the medieval period was not much greater than what we now expect of children. But as European societies became more urban, as the sights and smells of excreta became more overpowering, and as the social fabric grew more intricate, individuals were subjected to increasing pressures to control their instinctual urges and distance themselves from physiological processes. In a development comparable to children's internalization of parental demands, constraint by others gave way to self-constraint, and the rules of civilization were gradually internalized.[27]

Because the image of the body as clean, without apertures, and not needing to excrete stands in obvious contradiction to a universal physiological need, contemporary societies demand that individuals carefully monitor themselves to meet strict standards of propriety and decorum. As Erving Goffman points out in his extensive work on self-presentation in daily life, there is a large discrepancy between our socialized and our all-too-human selves. Social activity is not allowed to follow the trail of our bodily states, so that it is rare, for example, for someone to verbalize a desperate need for a toilet, as opposed to the number of time we might actually feel that way.[28] The bathroom is one of the ''backstage'' areas of contemporary existence where we can disarrange and reassemble our personal fronts and then magically reappear and present ourselves intact to others. Toilet doors have locks because elimination is an activity perceived as inconsistent with the cleanliness and purity that are an expected part of public performance. In functioning as audience for others' performances, we are happy to assist them with impression management because we share their stake in maintaining certain fictions.[29] We treat toilet stalls, for instance, as if they cut off communication more than they actually do. We generally ignore the sounds and smells that emanate from them, honoring their users' right to privacy.[30] The wide range of euphemisms used to avoiding naming the toilet and the varied strategies employed to disguise the fact one is headed there also function to cover over the reality of elimination as an integral part of daily life.

Mary Douglas helps to complete this picture of why it should be so difficult to raise issues of bathroom access by discussing the ways in which the body provides a system of symbols that represent the members of society and their obligations to the whole. The more complex a

social system and the stronger the pressure to preserve its boundaries, she says, ''the more social intercourse pretends to take place between disembodied spirits.'' In complex societies, individuals are expected to maintain bodily control; bodily processes are ignored and banned from public discussion; and any evidence of organic processes, such as burping or farting, is outlawed from dignified social occasions. Moreover, the higher people are on the social ladder, the more they are under pressure to act as if they are disembodied. The hierarchy of the parts of the body, such as brain over anus, is used to express social hierarchy, with the marginal members of society being more closely associated with smelly and messy body orifices. That is why refined individuals should never smack their lips when eating, and a CEO cannot be seen standing at a urinal next to his employees. Urine, feces, blood, spit, vomit, and milk, all traverse the boundaries of the body and thus represent its dangerous vulnerability, symbolizing the vulnerability of the social order.[31]

None of the theorists I have mentioned engages in serious gender analysis, and yet it is not difficult to see that the subject of elimination is deeply gendered. However much a particular society may relegate elimination to the backstage, women are indelibly linked to that backstage behavior. Infants come into the world ''between urine and feces,''[32] and mothers of infants and young children are generally in constant contact with both these substances. Not for them the pretense that bodies do not excrete or that feces can be whisked away. Excreta are a major presence in their lives, and the texture and quality of infant feces is an endlessly fascinating topic of conversation among new mothers. Women are also usually in charge of toilet training, so they are the agents of the civilizing process with its demands for order and cleanliness. From the infant's point of view, it summons the mother through feces.[33] Later, she is the one to whom it presents its first gift, the gift of a part of the body it will offer up in exchange for her smile or out of fear of her anger.[34] At the other end of life, it is women who most often care for the elderly, who help them to the bathroom or clean up their accidents or change their adult diapers. We might say that women are marked by feces in ways that are reinforced by the uncontrollability of their own leaky bodies. As Elizabeth Grosz points out, the onset of menstruation signals the beginning of an out-of-control status for women that was supposed to have ended with childhood. Soiling oneself with bodily

discharges is a normal condition of infancy but brands women as occupying a border between childhood and adulthood, nature, and culture. Women's bodies have been constructed as uncontrollable, formless, flowing, secreting, and viscous.[35]

Paradoxically, however, the cultural view of women's bodies as leaking, flowing, and out of control has not led to the creation of more restrooms for women where they can take their bleeding, peeing, and nursing selves! On the contrary, like other marginalized groups associated with the body—people with disabilities, transgender people, and homeless people—women have *less* access to toilet space where they can fulfill their physical needs. One group of sociologists that has studied bathroom behavior suggests that allowing people the shield of toilet stalls to perform what are socially regarded as ''potentially discrediting acts'' is a way acknowledging ''the small patrimony of sacredness'' to which every individual is entitled.[36] On this view, forcing women and other marginalized people to wait in long lines; to refrain from elimination for hours, risking urinary track infections and other physical problems; or to urinate in the street, is precisely to deny them that ''small patrimony of sacredness.'' In a society that does all that it can to hide and deny the excreting body, differential access to bathrooms is about more than differential access to power and public space. It is also about the privilege of maintaining the public appearance of being disembodied—a privilege granted mainly to young, able-bodied men, who can largely take for granted that some bathroom will be readily available when it is needed, and that any given bathroom will meet their needs.[37] Thus, we might say that feminist avoidance of the subject of elimination and issues of bathroom equity is a product of the same complex of symbolic and social meanings that denies women equal toilet space in the first place.

But then the reasons for feminist silence about these topics are the same reasons to break this silence. First, however effective our society may be at getting excreta to quickly disappear and covering over the reality that our bodies produce them, the need to eliminate waste is a basic part of what it means to be human. Urination and defecation, along with sweating, farting, bleeding, and vomiting, remind us that all bodies leak and transgress boundaries.[38] If feminists are serious about reclaiming the body, then we need accounts of corporeality that grapple

with those aspects of it that we have been taught to find shameful and repellent. Second, exploring the subject of elimination forces us into a certain realism about the materiality of the body and bodily basis of the social order and social action.[39] Even the most avid social constructionist, after all, must eventually get up from her or his desk to do ''what only the dead find unnecessary.'' Elimination thus provides an ideal starting point for analyzing the complex intersections between the demands of the organic body, and the ways in which they are shaped and constrained by the built environment, and culturally and symbolically elaborated in relation to hierarchies of gender, sexuality, race, class, and physical ability.[40] Third, bathrooms provide a focus for exploring intersections, conflicts, and possible alliances among a range of social movements. Precisely because elimination of waste is both a universal human need and an intrinsic part of everyday experience, it is also a good place to start recognizing and providing for a range of human differences.[41] At various points in U.S. history, the absence of toilet facilities has signaled to blacks, to women, to workers, to people with disabilities, to transgender people, and to homeless people that they are outsiders to the body politic and that there is no room for them in public space. By addressing the multiple ways in which the inequalities of power that shape our social relations manifest themselves in the mundane but crucial issue of bathroom access, bathroom activists can forge a multi-identity coalition that would do much to improve the quality of daily life.[42]

Lastly, it may be that frank and open engagement with issues of bathroom access and the need for elimination could lead us to find ways to come to terms with and even appreciate this dimension of experience. In his preface to the German translation of John Bourke's *Scatological Rites of All Nations*, Freud commented that the embarrassment of civilized people about anything that reminds them of their animal origins leads them to conceal from each other their excretory and sexual functions and also to withhold from them ''the attention and care which [they] might claim as…integrating component[s] of their essential being.''[43] What would it mean to experience excreta as parts of ourselves that enable us to live and grow rather than as affronts to our self-sufficient individuality that violate the borders of the sharply defined body? What would it mean to see them as symbols of fertility and not just death and decay, to view

our bodily orifices as places where we go out to meet the world, rather than as sites of potential pollution from without or within?[44] In the words of Alexander Kira, author of a classic work on the bathroom, could we ''accept the demands of this physiological need with the same, grace, humor, and possibly enjoyment that we accept our other physiological needs?''[45] Is such a goal possible? Certainly not unless feminists break the silence around elimination as we have broken so many others.

Notes

1. Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction,* trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 32, 35.
2. Brown, Norman O., *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1959), 180.
3. Chess, Simone, Alison Kafer, Jessi Quizar, Mattie Udora Richardson, ''Calling All Restroom Revolutionaries,'' in *That's Revolting: Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation,* ed., Matilda aka Matt Bernstein Sycamore (Brooklyn: Soft Skull press, 2004), 189. Cf. Kafer, Alison, '''It Ain't My Revolution If It Ain't Accessible': Toward a Politics of Access'' (unpublished manuscript, 2007), 232-35.
4. Talev, Margaret, '''Potty Parity' Is Revisited as House Gets Its First Female Speaker,'' McClatchy Newspapers, December 21, 2006.
5. Ibid.
6. Dershowitz, Alan M., *The Abuse Excuse and Other Cop-outs, Sob Stories, and Evasions of Responsibility* (Boston, New York, Toronto, and London: Little Brown and Company, 1994), 284; Rhode, Deborah L., *Justice and Gender: Sex Discrimination and the Law* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 24.
7. Cooper, Patricia and Ruth Oldenziel, ''Cherished Classifications: Bathrooms and the Construction of Gender/Race on the Pennsylvania Railroad During World War II,'' *Feminist Studies* 25 (Spring 1999), 17.
8. Edwards, Julia and Linda McKie, ''Women's Public Toilets: A Serious Issue for the Body Politic,'' in *Embodied Practices: Feminist Perspectives on the Body,* ed., Kathy Davis (London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997), 136-38.
9. *Better Bladder and Bowel Control,* A Special Health Report from Harvard Medical School (Cambridge, 2007), 4, 5, 7, 8; Watson, Stephanie, *The Urinary System* (Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 2004), 21, 22, 120-21, 152, 170.
10. Weisman, Leslie Kanes, *Discrimination by Design: A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made Environment* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 2; Penner, Barbara, ''A World of Unmentionable Suffering: Women's Public Conveniences in Victorian London,'' *Journal of Design History* 14/1 (2001): 37.
11. Weisman, *Discrimination by Design*, 1, 10. Quotation on p. 1.
12. See Chess et al., ''Calling All Restroom Revolutionaries,'' for an account of one local activist group.

13. Anthony, Kathryn H. and Meghan Dufresne, ''Potty Parity in Perspective: Gender and Family Issues in Planning and Designing Public Restrooms,'' *Journal of Planning Literature* 21/3 (February 2007): 268, 278. The precise definition of potty parity varies from state to state.
14. Banzhof, John F. II, ''Final Frontier for the Law?'' *The National Law Journal*, April 18, 1990. Accessed on http://www.banzhof.net/docs/potty_parity.html.
15. Gershenson, Olga, ''Potty Politics on Campus: Debates Over Unisex Bathrooms'' (unpublished manuscript, 2005), 1.
16. Bradley, Matt, '''Potty Parity' Aims to Remedy Long Lines,'' *Christian Science Monitor,* January 19, 2006. Available on http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0119/p16s01-lihc.htm.
17. A long series of exchanges on the women's studies listserve (wmst-l@listserve.umd.edu) in February 2007 explored some of these issues, sometimes in surprisingly prejudicial ways.
18. Deuteronomy 23:12-4.
19. Inglis, David, *A Sociological History of Excretory Experience: Defecatory Manners and Toiletry Technology,* Mellen Studies in Sociology, Vol. 30 (Lewiston, Queenstown, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), 1, 3, 65-6.
20. Corbin, Alain, *The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 24.
21. Elias, Norbert, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners,* Vol. I, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Urizen Books, 1978), 131.
22. Corbin, *The Foul and the Fragrant,* 20, 89.
23. Inglis, *A Sociological History of Excretory Experience,* 48-49, 161. On the issue of linguistic invisibility, cf. Corbin, *The Foul and the Fragrant,* 61 and Alexander Kira, *The Bathroom*, new and expanded ed. (New York: Viking Press, 1976), 99-100.
24. Inglis, *A Sociological History of Excretory Experience*, 243.
25. Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, Vol. I, xiii.
26. Freud, Sigmund, ''The Excretory Functions in Psychoanalysis and Folklore,'' *Collected Papers,* Vol. 5, ed. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1950), 90; and *Civilization and its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey (New York: WW Norton, 1961), 47. n.1.
27. Elias, *The Civilizing Process,* Vol. I, 80, 82, 141, 190; *The Civilizing Process: State Formation and Civilization,* Vol. II, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1982 [1939]), 230, 233.
28. Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959), 56; Susan Wendell, *The Rejected Body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996), 89.
29. Goffman, *The Presentation of Self*, 55, 56, 112, 121, 229.
30. Cahill, Spencer, William Distler, Cynthia Lachowitz, Andrea Meany, Royn Taralls and Teena Willard, ''Meanwhile Backstage: Public Bathrooms and the Interaction Order,'' *Urban Life* 14:1 (April 1985): 36-9.
31. Douglas, Mary, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), 12, 100, 101; *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London and New York: Routledge, 1966), 121. The quotation is from *Natural Symbols*, 101.
32. This line has been variously attributed to a number of different early Christian thinkers.

33. Corbin, *The Foul and the Fragrant*, 213.
34. Freud, Sigmund, ''On Transformations of Instinct as Exemplified in Anal Eroticism,'' *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. IX, ed., James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1959), 130.
35. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 203-6.
36. Cahill et al., ''Meanwhile Backstage,'' 37, 39.
37. Chess et al., in ''Calling All Restroom Revolutionaries,'' call this ''pee-privilege,'' 189.
38. Longhurst, Robyn, *Bodies: Exploring Fluid Boundaries* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), 4, 23.
39. Williams, Simon J. and Gillian Bendelow, *The Lived Body: Sociological Themes, Embodied Issues* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 208; cf. Thomas, Carol, ''The 'Disabled' Body,'' *Real Bodies: A Sociological Introduction*, ed., Mary Evans and Ellie Lee (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 72.
40. Williams and Bendelow, *The Lived Body,* 175 make this point about *sleep*, but I am struck by its equal applicability to elimination.
41. Banks, Taunya Lovell, ''Toilets as a Feminist Issue: A True Story,'' *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 6/2 (1990): 284.
42. Chess et al., ''Calling All Restroom Revolutionaries,''192-93.
43. Freud, ''The Excretory Functions,'' 88-9.
44. For a radically different vision of the nature of elimination, see Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and his World,* trans. Helene Iswolsky (N.p.: MIT, 1969; Indiana University Press, 1984), esp. 26; also Miller, William Ian, *The Anatomy of Disgust* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 89.
45. Kira, *The Bathroom*, 105.