

THE SCHOLAR AND THE FEMINIST
XIX

MORNING PLENARY SESSION:
WHITHER FEMINISM?

Saturday, April 24, 1993

Leslie Calman, Director, Barnard Center for Research on Women: Good morning. I am Leslie Calman, the Director of the Barnard Center for Research on Women, and it is my pleasure to introduce you to the Center's 19th *The Scholar and The Feminist* Conference. Many a sleepless night in recent weeks I have pondered this moment: and I am delighted that this day, this conference, and all of you, are finally here. Welcome.

This year, our conference probes the issue of *Women as Change Makers: Building and Using Political Power*. The planning has been in the making for about a year, and so it began when I, like many others, were beginning to have fond hopes that 1992 would be The Year of The Woman.

Then, as now, it was spring, traditionally a time of hope and renewal. A good omen. It is also the season of the year that includes a holiday that I celebrate: Passover. Now, at first glance, the liberation of the Jews from the tyranny of slavery and hoping for more women in Congress may seem but loosely connected, but for me they have something very important in common.

Every year, during the story-telling that accompanies Passover, there's a particularly rousing, catchy song. The verses of the song describe things God did for the Jewish people in the process of liberating them, and after every verse the chorus is a single Hebrew word: dayenu. Translated, it means, roughly, "It would have been enough."

So the song goes like this: If God had *only* parted the red sea: dayenu-- it would have been enough. If God had *only* given us the ten commandments: dayenu -- it would have been enough. If God had *only* dropped manna from heaven: dayenu -- it would have been enough.

Now, ever since I was a child -- a skeptical child *not* the favorite of my Hebrew school teachers -- this song has bothered me. Every year I think: What do you mean, it would have been enough?

This process of liberation seemed to me to be a pretty complicated business, and then, as now, I suspected that just *one* of these acts of god, no matter how nifty, would *not* have done the trick. Now don't get me wrong. Even just one of these miracles would, to be sure, have been welcome. It would be nice. But, no, for the difficult task of liberation, one advance alone would *not* have been enough!

I think of the political year of 1992 as the year that some would have us think of as the dayenu year for women: the Year Women Got What Should Have Been Enough. We had... a whole year! The number of women senators tripled (OK, so it's still just 6 percent); the number of women Congressional representatives increased from 28 to 47 representatives, moving them from 7% to 11% of the House. We have women cabinet appointments (OK, so they don't have kids).

All this is good. But: Dayenu? It would have been enough? I don't think so. We're at

the beginning, not the end, of victory.

The good news is that this election year was almost certainly not a fluke, but rather a culmination of twenty years of the women's movement in politics. Over that time, since the early 70s, we've been seeing steady increases in the numbers of women in state and local government; women are 17% of the nation's mayors and they are some 20% of state legislators across the country, a figure that's triple the number twenty years earlier.

Women have grown savvier, too, about fund raising, and are therefore better positioned to run, and to run effectively. We can look to the future with some confidence, but we need to plan carefully for the electoral and the policy struggles ahead.

Women have always been targets of state policy, but too rarely the creators of it. This conference asks about the relationship of women to the power of government: how do they get it, what do they do with it once they do get it, what *should* they do with it?

We need to think today about how the state's policies and structures affect women and the women's movement. We need to explore the ideas, the laws, and the patterns of action that shape politics. And we must look specifically to how women as lawmakers, judges and bureaucrats, women organized in interest groups, women acting within political parties, working in the media, engaging in direct action, can, do and should transform policy.

We need to ask, too: What are women's interests? And recognize that they may not all be the same, and that the impact of state actions differs substantially depending on our race and class. With that in mind, we need to consider: How involved do we want the state to be in women's lives, and in what ways? When do we want the state to stay out of our lives?

This conference marks the certainty that women in politics and those of us who are seeking more political power for women must not be reticent when we insist that we don't yet have enough, and when we plan and strategize to get more.

Let's take a lesson from Dorothy Parker, who, when reprimanded for being outspoken, demanded indignantly to know: "Outspoken? By whom?" Let's make sure it's not Pat Buchanan...or Dan Quayle...or Pat Robertson.

Before we begin our panel this morning, it is my pleasure to introduce a decidedly outspoken woman, Ellen Futter, President of Barnard College.

Ellen Futter, President, Barnard College: Good morning and welcome to the nineteenth *The Scholar and the Feminist* Conference -- a conference that has the distinction of not only addressing a critical subject, but of welcoming the third decade of the Barnard Center for Research on Women.

This morning's task is great, but our participants are every bit up to the challenge, for this is truly a most exceptional assembly of talent -- for which we should all thank Leslie Calman, the Director of the Center and the one who put this terrific conference together.

The Barnard Center for Research on Women was founded in 1971 as a meeting ground for addressing critical issues concerning the status of women beyond the traditional confines of the classroom. Since then, supported strongly by the college and by friends and foundations, the Center has offered program after program raising hard questions, taking on provocative issues, and providing a safe haven for women to conduct research. In short, it has been both a stimulus for and a source of feminist scholarship. I am reminded here of Rebecca West's comment in 1913 that, "I myself have never been able to find out precisely what feminism is, I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat or a prostitute."

Today's conference continues in the tradition of past *Scholar and Feminist* conferences, confronting directly the question of "whither feminism," and endeavoring to chart the way for women as change makers and for women to build and use political power. As Leslie Calman suggested: Some may question why this is necessary following the so-called "Year of the Woman." But the fact is that anytime the label "the year of" is utilized, there's a strong presumption that the single "year of" has been preceded by a series of years of neglect, and this is precisely the case for women.

The mystery writer Dorothy Sayers once observed that facts are like cows. "If you look them in the face hard enough they generally run away." Well, the facts about women are more like bulls--or maybe mules. While there is reason to be enthusiastically "bullish" about the achievements of women in recent years, the facts themselves are stubborn reminders that there is much to be done.

As you begin your deliberations about women as change makers, I urge you to do so with as broad gauged a view as possible. Too often in years past, women's issues have been defined as encompassing only matters of equal pay for equal work, reproductive rights, or child care--all critical issues of central importance to women. But so too are issues of crime, poverty, drugs, healthcare, homelessness, discrimination and the condition of our schools and families. The often overlooked fact is that as tragic as the consequences of these issues are for society as a whole, and as much as they are also men's issues, the victims of these tragedies are disproportionately women and the feminization of poverty is well documented. So too, as has been demonstrated with horrific clarity by the atrocities in Bosnia and the disposition of girl babies in China,

are issues of international affairs. As you consider the role of women as change makers, it is vital to remember that if women are to achieve not only equal pay for equal work, but equity in the fullest sense, they must be actively engaged in the most pressing matters of our time in our cities, throughout our country, and on the world stage. We must no longer allow women's issues to be placed in a separate category at the bottom of the agenda.

This is so for several reasons. Not least because as goes equity for women will go equities for others, not in the sense of following the other in temporal terms, but rather as a reflection of the spirit and commitment of the leadership and citizenry of the country to do right not only by the community of women, but by all its people. And advancement of women should come not only because it is the law of the land, but because it is the will of the people, reflective of the authenticity of their commitment and goodness of spirit.

Writing at the time of the founding of the Women's Center, Mirra Komorovsky, Barnard's distinguished alumna and Professor of Sociology, observed in describing the importance of women's studies, "Such studies address themselves to intellectual problems of broad theoretical significance. Moreover, they illuminate the social roots of personal conflicts and may thus serve to increase rationality in human affairs." This conference is, at root, about precisely that: Women as Change Makers utilizing new found political power to increase rationality in human affairs -- in terms of equity for women, of course, but beyond-- to the achievement of equity for all.

I welcome you all to Barnard College and wish you a most enjoyable and productive day.

Leslie Calman: This morning's plenary panel addresses the future of the feminist movement and the nature of the opposition to feminism. My role here is to pose some questions. That's the easy part. I've saved the hard parts --- that is the answers--- for our distinguished panelists.

I've asked the panelists to think about questions like these:

Where do women, and where do feminists, go from here? What are our goals? What are "women's interests?"

What should our strategies be for influencing or gaining power? And how promising is the Clinton administration in terms of women's issues?

And about the women's movement itself: Political and social movements, by their nature, are not static. If they are to succeed, they must *move* people. Movements must persuade, they must mobilize; they must build. Movements must convert people not only to new consciousness, but also to action.

My question then is this: Is the women's movement still moving? Will the movement become coopted or more fragmented because we have a friend (or two) in the White House? How are we going to continue to build, and how shall we meet the challenge of the strong and fervent opposition arrayed against us?

Let me introduce our panelists, who will neatly, concisely, and fully answer each and every one of these questions!

Well, they may not be able to do that, but they do have a collective experience of being in the trenches that is exhausting to consider.

Marie Wilson has for the past seven years been President of the Ms. Foundation for Women. The Ms. Foundation is the only national multi-issue women's fund in the United States. Ms. Wilson is an expert on women's economic development, on reproductive rights, and on safety for women and girls. She is co-author of a soon-to-be published book on new models for relationships between mothers and their adolescent daughters. Under her direction, the Ms. Foundation has launched a widely hailed national campaign called *Take Our Daughters To Work*, designed to improve the self-esteem of adolescent girls. *Take Our Daughters to Work Day* is this Wednesday, April 28, and this is a plug for that great idea.

Our next panelist, Catharine R. Stimpson is one of our nation's most renowned scholars in the field of Women's Studies. She is presently University Professor at Rutgers University, and has also served there as Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education. In 1975, she founded what remains the premier journal of Women's Studies, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. A few years before that, as a member of the English Department at Barnard College, Professor Stimpson was the founding Director of its Women's Center, now known as the Barnard Center for Research on Women. She is the author of over 150 monographs, essays, stories and reviews on a wide range of cultural and political topics. I could go on, but will close by adding that her legacy includes being my very first Women's Studies professor, for which I once again thank her.

Tanya Melich is a political management and public policy consultant with particular expertise in women's issues and elections. In 1971, she helped organize the Manhattan Women's Political Caucus, and in 1972 the New York State Women's Political Caucus. Since 1973 she has been an active and vocal proponent for women's reproductive freedom, and her targets of action include most prominently... the Republican Party. Ms. Melich originated the Republican pro-choice movement in 1976; in 1984 she helped found and now directs the New York State Family Committee. This Committee seeks to educate Republicans on reproductive health issues and urges the Republican Party's adoption of pro-choice policies. Following the Supreme Court's Webster decision in 1989 threatening legal abortion, Ms. Melich became a founder of two Republican pro-choice Political Action Committees, one in New York State, and one a national PAC, both of which provide funds to pro-choice

Republican candidates.

Faye Wattleton served for 14 years as the President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Under her leadership Planned Parenthood moved into the forefront of the battle to protect women's reproductive rights and women's health both in this country and around the world. Ms. Wattleton is the recipient of a stream of awards including the American Public Health Association's Award of Excellence; the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Humanitarian Award; and the Women in Public Service Award from the American Nurses Association. In Spring 1992, Faye Wattleton was also the recipient of Barnard's Reid Lectureship, given annually to a distinguished woman who has shown a continuing commitment to serving other women. Of course, none of these honors can compete with the fact that one of the most critical shapers of our adolescent daughters' political consciousness, namely Sassy magazine, has proclaimed Faye Wattleton one of the "20 Coolest Women Ever." I am delighted to welcome her back.

Kathy Spillar is appearing today in the place of Eleanor Smeal, who is recovering from a case of pneumonia and pleurisy, and regrets very much not being able to be with us today. Kathy Spillar is National Coordinator of the organizations of which Ellie Smeal is President: namely, the Fund for the Feminist Majority, and the Feminist Majority Foundation. She was one of the original principals in their founding in 1987. Prior to that, she was for four years the President of Los Angeles NOW. The Fund is presently sponsoring the Feminization of Power Campaign, a nationwide effort to inspire women to seek leadership positions and to promote a feminist agenda. Additionally, the Fund runs the largest clinic defense project in the country, to defend against the intimidation, violence and harassment of abortion clinics and their clients. Another project of the Fund involves working to achieve gender balance in law enforcement as a way of addressing violence against women. I am delighted to have Kathy Spillar with us today, and thank her for so graciously coming at the last moment.

Finally, I am sorry to tell you that Jewel Jackson McCabe, who was originally scheduled to be with us this morning, has had instead to attend an important meeting of the Tuskegee branch of 100 Black Women and is unable to join us.

Our program this morning will begin with statements by each of our panelists, to be followed by discussion and questions with the audience. Microphones have been placed in each of the two aisles, and when the time comes, please line up and I'll recognize you.

First, let me introduce Marie Wilson.

Marie Wilson, Executive Director, Ms. Foundation: I'm delighted to be here because actually my coming to New York in the first place began with Barnard. I don't think Ellen or anyone here knows this, but I really came to interview for the job at the Ms. Foundation as a way to see my daughter who had just gotten into Barnard and whom I missed enormously. I was being a politician in Iowa and I was really happy, but I missed her. So I came and interviewed for the job, and as life goes they talked me into the fact that you could make more political change at Ms. than being a politician in Iowa, and it worked. So, I really credit Barnard for that, as well as for giving my daughter an absolutely smashing education. She is a performance artist in Santa Fe who does work on domestic violence and other issues through performance, and she has the greatest education in the world.

When somebody tells you that you get to address "whither feminism?" you get all excited like, "Oh, this is wonderful." And then you think, "Where do you start?" Well, I can look at the women who are in this room, many of whom I know and trust and love, and women who are up here who have kept education together and who have kept the Republican Party from going off the side of the earth...well, almost. Faye, who has been the strongest and steadiest voice for women and reproductive freedom and reproductive health in this country. And Kathy Spillar, who is probably one of the brightest organizers to ever come out of our movement. I mean, "whither feminism?": It's in pretty good shape if the leadership that you see here is any indication.

But, I do want to talk to you about what I think the challenges are: I think they are challenges of courage. And I say that with some fear and trembling, because I think the lives of everyday women in this country are usually just plain studies in courage. But there is more courage to be had. I want to tell you a couple of things I feel like we've learned this year that I think give us a great deal more claim to courage.

The first thing I want to address is what Leslie [Calman] mentioned: What do we do with this administration? I think it's about having the courage to claim what we paid for and to pay for what we now claim. I never trust an administration, no matter how good they are. Gloria Steinem says about Franklin Roosevelt that after he was elected he turned around and said, "You elected me. Now make me do it." That's what the courage is about in regard to the Clinton Administration -- they are our administration, we did elect them, there was a very little publicized gender gap. And now our role is to have the courage to make them do what we know they want to do. That means, by the way, that we must establish a much stronger relationship between the national and the local women's communities, because that's how constituency gets built, and that's how change gets pushed. And what we are faced with (and I think Kathy is working on this a great deal), are local women who are closest to the people that can make that change happen but are not always feeling represented well and fully by the national organizations. So one of the things I've learned about through my work at Ms. is the courage of local women, and the fact that they have to be connected nationally.

The second thing that it seems to me we need is the courage to really push harder. The

Ms. Foundation did the largest survey (a bi-partisan survey), that's ever been done, called *Women's Voices*, this past September. We over-sampled across race -- that's never been done -- to hear what the voices of women were saying. And one thing that really surprised us was what women said about leadership. Three quarters of the women in this country, African American women and Latinas most strongly, actually feel that their lives are different because of the women's movement. The women of this country credit the women's movement with positive economic changes, led by African American women and Latinas. Three quarters of the women in this country believe that this whole country would be better off if half the leadership were women. And that goes for men as well. More men than ever before believe that the country would be better if over half the leadership positions were filled by women.

That is an amazing statistic, and again, led by African American women and Latinas. I say that because we have a "woman-date" for change. We have this power that it is out there because women really believe in women. And I'm afraid that we won't have the courage to take it far enough. And getting to a particular political example, I want to talk for just a minute about the Freedom of Choice Act, the reversal of the Hyde Amendment, and what's going on around healthcare. I think we have a woman-date that says we can push harder than we think we can push and not leave any women behind. Not our daughters, not poor women, not women of color. And I'm concerned that what we'll do is not know that we have a woman-date that allows us to push as hard as we want to push. That may be a good thing for us to debate this morning, whether or not we have the voices of women in this country supporting us in going further.

The third thing I want to talk to you about is the courage we have found from working with adolescent and pre-adolescent girls and *Take Our Daughters to Work*. I have never seen anything take off like *Take Our Daughters*. This was the little project that ate Cleveland. We had thought that this would be a nice project to do in New York City. It was our way of trying to focus the country's attention on the strong and courageous voices of our daughters. And once it got out there people everywhere, in 50 states and Japan and Korea, began calling us to join this project. When I talked to Carol Gilligan a couple of years ago about her research on girls, the thing that we asked ourselves was, How do you keep the public's attention focused on girls? And what could we do? Could we design an ad that just had the faces of all different kinds of girls on it, and after every television program and on every billboard and everywhere in this country have the following words: "A girl is watching this. What is she learning about being a woman?"

I mention this because I woke up this morning and changed a little of what I wanted to say to you. I saw the paper and I saw what happened with this whole Tailhook sexual harassment report on the front page; this story about women as property and the findings of the whole investigation, the number who are involved, and I asked myself in terms of power, "A girl is reading the paper this morning. What is she learning about being a woman?" And then I looked down and saw that the young men in New

Jersey who were convicted of aggravated sexual assault are going to be out on bail until all of their retrial attempts are exhausted. Again I thought, "A girl is watching that. What is she learning about being a woman?" So one thing I want ask is what are girls learning from us about courage and about being a woman? What are they learning about standing up and telling the truth? We have an advisory committee of young women and they are so smart about what we are doing. They look at us and they see how we struggle with power and they completely get it. They're concerned about our voices being heard. We were having this power discussion and one girl said, "You know, when a man takes a woman's ideas why doesn't the woman fight?" The she thought more and added, "If she fights they're mad at her, but if she doesn't fight then she's mad at herself." Finally she said, "You know, I don't think women fight hard enough." I said, "Do all of you think that?" And a little girl across the circle said, "Nah, I don't think that. It's not that women don't fight hard enough, it's that not enough women fight."

That's what our daughters are watching and learning; that not enough women fight. What they're also learning is that this fight is about a radical solidarity of women, a radical solidarity enriched by what Audre Lorde knew would always enrich us, a real genuine appreciation and articulation of difference; of difference by race and class and sexual orientation. Our daughters need a joined community of women, and that takes courage beyond what we have done in this country up to now. *Take Our Daughters* is just a part. I want to add that I have never seen anything like what men have learned through this project. We have men who come and talk to us and, because they may not believe us, they then go out and talk to little girls. One man came back and said, "I heard girls talk about men and fathers as the enemy. That is never happening to my daughter." And so, I'm very encouraged that men can learn from girls as well.

And finally, in terms of sparking discussion about whither feminism, I think we have to look at the whole notion of what does it mean to put women at the center of your life. That's starting to happen. It's starting to happen and it's radical. Earlier this morning I heard Ellen [Futter] and Faye [Wattleton] talk about what they are willing to do to get together with the women in their supportive community. What's really hard, and what our daughters see at adolescence, is that men, and not women, are still the center of life; and that's the message: that it's not safe to be at the center of you're own life. What's kept us apart is not only race and class, but also disability, age, and especially sexual orientation. I want to leave you with the parting words that it is not about who you sleep with that is a transgression in patriarchy, it is about whether you choose to give your life's energy to women. If you put women at the center of your life, if you choose to give your life's energy to women, then you will have transgressed beyond any charge of being a lesbian. One of the things I most love and admire about Gloria Steinem is that years ago she stood up in front of women and said, "Why doesn't everybody just come out?" And that may be the thing to do -- that everybody come out, not as lesbians, but as loving women. That's the real piece of courage, to put women at the center of our lives. That's the core of political power.

Prof. Catharine R. Stimpson, Rutgers University* : Marie quite correctly called on us for courage, and in that spirit, after thanking Leslie and Ellen for bringing us together, I want to tell you of a tale of courage in this very auditorium. I was a young professor here and I was invited to join in a pick-up basketball game between the women's liberation team on one side and the male faculty on the other. I don't know what it meant, but I was the only faculty member on the women's liberation team and I was given a little t-shirt that I still have with the Women's Liberation symbol on the back and the word "Ace" on the front. It turned out to be totally complimentary since I fouled-out in the first quarter. I turned to the referee and said, "Ref, I haven't done anything wrong." She said, "Lady, if I'd called everything you'd done wrong you would have been out of here in 30 seconds."

It was really a contrasting study of power. The men had practised week after week after week, and the guys came in, muscles flexing. The women hadn't practised. They were counting on their cheerleaders. Their cheerleaders came in wearing witches' hats and carrying broomsticks, and their idea of a cheer was to go, "Hex, hex, hex, hex!" Well, the score came mounting up, men 20 women 2, men 40 women 4. After I fouled-out I took as my responsibility to go behind the blackboard on which the score was being registered and erase the men's score, just to make it look a little better. But the women kept on, "Hex, hex," and then one of the most aggressive, muscular, macho of the men fell to the floor with a broken ankle. And the women cheerleaders, instead of saying, "Women power," had this spasm of guilt and went, "Did we really do that? Did we break Bob McGinn's ankle?"

My general subject in my few minutes is going to be women, information, and feminism. As we all know, in the 1960s the struggle for women and change that consumed us all emerged at exactly the same time as the Information Society. Some dates: In 1962 what is considered the founding text of the Information Society by the economist Fritz Machlup was published. In 1963 Betty Friedan published the Feminine Mystique. In 1972 the Japanese issued a very important plan for their society called The Plan for the Information Society. In that same year, '72, *Ms.* magazine went into action. In 1977, the American Library Association asked how to devise libraries for the information age? And in that same year, '77, Elaine Showalter published A Literature of Their Own and Barbara K. Smith published Toward A Black Feminist Criticism. In 1982 John Nesbitt in Megatrends told Americans that the most important change in their life was towards an Information Society, and in that year Carol Gilligan -- who may be the footnote of choice, at least of us, Marie -- authored In A Different Voice. Now what does it mean? Are these simply publication coincidences? I don't think so.

* Parts of Catharine Stimpson's remarks have appeared previously in: ACLS Occasional Paper #20, 1993 and The 1992 Proceedings of the National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries.

In the Information Society education matters, not just for self-enlightenment, but for survival and success. As one commentator has written, although not very felicitously, "Upward access through the social economic strata of this society is assumed to depend upon advanced education even more than at present." We supporters of the struggle for women know that women must be full citizens of the Information Society and opponents of the struggle for women do not want women to be full citizens of the Information Society. Feminism for centuries has cared passionately about women's education and information. For us education and information has been the necessary means to the ends of autonomy, dignity, equality, mobility, self-sufficiency, power, and, even with luck, a little pleasure. So misogynists and the blindest of gender traditionalists have been right to fear the consequences of information for women. I'm sure you all know the feminist button which reads, "I think, therefore I am dangerous."

Now, self-consciously and imaginatively contemporary feminism has structured itself as an education reform movement with five goals, and I would suggest that these five goals mattered in the 1960s and still matter in the 1990s, and that the Clinton Administration can support them all. What are they? First, feminism would improve child-rearing and socialization practises, and other people here can speak to that better than I. But I would say: support any measure against spouse abuse, support any measure against child abuse, support Head Start, support nutrition. The second educational goal was: Feminism would organize small consciousness-raising groups in which women would learn from each other about their lives in order to change those lives. I guess maybe no state power can do much about consciousness-raising groups, nor should it. In fact, I think if there was a bill to give government funding for consciousness-raising groups something would have gone a little wrong. Feminism's third objective would be an attack on the media, the studios that market lessons and images, often trumped up, for a mass culture. And here, I think, the Clinton Administration can support access for all constituencies and all people to cable t.v., to really make cable t.v. and radio a grassroots activity. The fourth educational goal was that feminism would create cultural alternatives, a splendidly new art, literature, film, music, journalism, and religion. To this end the Clinton Administration can change three agencies: the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Institute of Museum Services, so that those three agencies can become genuine supporters of intellectual and cultural freedom, and so that those three agencies take genuine risks and support innovative artistic and intellectual and cultural work. And finally, a fifth goal would be that we would transform the educational system from childcare to research centers. And here, there are a number of policies that can work.

Now, the explicit alliance between feminism and education has had its triumphs, especially in higher education. Indeed, the triumphs have been such that a friend of mine has written about higher education that, "feminists are beset by the fear that academe will declare premature victory for women in higher education, that the students will believe that the crisis is passed, and that to contemporary students

feminists will seem feminine Deadheads, congregating periodically around a few aging leaders so as to hear a tired repetition of a few standard tunes left over from the 1960s." The triumphs have been genuine. In the United States, at least, most overt discrimination has disappeared. We are aware of sex discrimination as an issue, of on-campus rape, of date rape, and of sexual harassment. And I would hope that the Clinton Administration would support efforts -- such as those now going on in the NOW LDEF [Legal Defense and Education Fund] -- to work against sexual harassment in high schools and junior highs. Meryl Streep once said in a Vassar commencement address that she was asked, "What is real life like?" And she said, "It's not like college. It's worse. Real life is like high school." I didn't like high school when I was there, and I really think because of the greater sexual harassment high school is even worse now, not to mention the violence.

We are, too, much more aware of the differences among women, especially the racial differences, and we are much more aware of the need of giving access to education to women of all races, all classes. People know the statistics, but let me remind you of it. Between 1980 and 1990 the number of Native American women attending college increased 30 percent, the number of Asian American women 19 percent, the number of African American women 16 percent, the number of Hispanic women 73 percent, the number of White women 15 percent. If there's anything I would like the Clinton Administration to do it is to make sure that access to information and education is still available for people of all classes and races. That means financial aid, and it means policies and plans such as childcare centers that will keep people in school once they get there. And another triumph is, of course, the change in our curriculum to include new subjects about race, about gender, about sexual preference. The Department of Education and other federal funding agencies can support the transformation of the curriculum.

But a couple of other suggestions. As I regard the future of women in the Information Society I have my market share of dread, and I do fear that we will not grant women full citizenship in the Information Society and that we will not grant them access to basic literacy. If some night you can't sleep -- C-Span isn't doing it for you, and herbal teas called Sleepytime are not working -- read Table 1.3 of the 1989 UNESCO Statistical Yearbook and it will give you the percentage of men and women over the age of 15 who were illiterate in 129 countries and territories. The percentage of illiterate men is alarming, but the percentage of illiterate women is even more so. Of these 129 countries, the sexes are equally literate in fewer than 20 countries, women are more literate than men in only 11 places, all of them small, most of them in the Caribbean, and men are more literate than women in every other one of these countries. So I would urge the Clinton Administration to support not only reproductive rights internationally, but sheer basic literacy.

And when I have my moments of dread, I think too of equal access to the sciences and technologies that are the foundation of the Information Society. A recent study, the AAUW [American Association of University Women's *How Schools Shortchange*

Girls] study, found that 49 percent of the boys in the eleventh grade in American high schools had used an electricity meter, whatever that is, but only 17 percent of the girls had. Now, I don't know what an electricity meter is, but I want the other 83 percent of the girls to get it! In 1989 men took 91.8 percent of the doctorates in engineering in American graduate schools, women 8.2 percent. Men took 81.2 percent of the doctorates in the physical sciences, women took 18.8 percent. So Clinton Administration, shape up the primary schools in terms of science education for young women.

Nor, I fear, will we give women the information they need about themselves, about their history, and about their capacity for love and work in the Information Society. I fear an absence of information about body, health, and sexuality. The story of the silicon gel implants seems, in part, a story about women being both misinformed and uninformed about their health. The story also seems, in part, a story about some women who still obey powerful cultural norms that reduce their identity to their flesh and to their sexual allure, and ironically the Information Society tells us that our minds, not our bodies, are our power generators.

So I have my little anxieties, but some of you have heard me say before that I have a stubborn muscle in my optimism. Marie preaches courage, I preach optimism. Given my choice to be a Pollyanna or not, I will take Pollyanna whenever I can. And so the muscle of my optimism flexes and insists that history can be its Nautilus machine. So let me leave you with an optimistic story about women in the Information Society. It comes from my hometown newspaper, *The New York Times*, a journal that Marie flashed before you. And as you know, it is a journal that often throws acid on optimism. But in 1991 there was a headline, "Brooklyn College Firsts: Marshalls and Rhodes," and for the first time in its 61-year history Brooklyn College had won both a Marshall scholarship and a Rhodes scholarship, both prestigious, both for study in England. We all know that President Clinton was a Rhodes scholar. We may also remember that, in great part thanks to the women's movement, women could become Rhodes scholars 8 years after President Clinton was. Well, the winners were women, Lisette Nieves, who had won the Rhodes, and Toba Friedman, who had won the Marshall. And Toba Friedman said that she had never planned to go to college, but she was working as a secretary and she found her mind, "Going to mush." And a friend said, "Try college." And in my cynical moments I say college does not turn your mind to mush but it turns it to All-Bran. And so, Toba Friedman went to Brooklyn College and took a course in English history taught by a woman named Bonnie Anderson, one of the founders of women's history. And Friedman said, "She blew me away." Clinton Administration, work for Lisette Nieves and Toba Friedman.

Thank you.

Tanya Melich, Republican feminist consultant and analyst: I think they both blew us away. They're wonderful. I went through a political nervous breakdown in 1992 so it's wonderful to come and be revitalized and share in the excitement of another 20, 50, 100 years of the Barnard Center for Research on Women.

Like many of those on this panel I began working in the women's movement in 1971. Very early on it was clear to some of us that if there was to be meaningful change, if women's lives were going to improve, we needed a hell of a lot of political power. It was not going to be enough to have women's studies programs, consciousness raising sessions, our own theaters, our own magazines, newspapers, and research institutes like this first rate one at Barnard. We knew we had to learn how to understand each other, how to talk to each other, how to set our issue agendas, and how to work together. But we also knew we had to lay the groundwork for assaulting the male power structure. Piece by piece we built a political movement. Much of our success in '92, that so-called Year of the Woman -- that's a joke, I agree -- came because we had built the feminist political tools. We had the training, we had the recruitment, we had the funding, we had the grassroots, we had the policy ideas, we had women candidates and we had reapportionment. The 22-year painstaking building was finally paying off, but it was too, too slow, and it still is.

From the beginning, I have been guided by a two-party view for gaining political power. That is, our feminist revolution would only succeed when we wielded substantial influence in both political parties. My hope -- call it a dream -- was that the basic premises of feminism would be accepted by majorities in both parties, and that we Republican and Democratic feminist women would struggle and debate over the details of public policy. I have never believed, and I do not believe now, that a third party was a valid option. I think Alice Paul with all her great struggles proved that.

After the brutalization of the last 12 years, my dream has been sorely challenged. Many Republicans and Independent women voted for Clinton. We worked for Dianne Feinstein and for Barbara Boxer and other progressive candidates, and we rejoiced in their victories.

Republican and centrist women are often asked why we don't become Democrats since we so often find ourselves aligned with Democratic candidates. But that question blurs the complexity of the feminist movement's efforts to gain and retain -- and I emphasize retain -- political power. It is a cliched superficial question my sisters ask me as to why I don't become a Democrat, and I think the question needs to be analyzed more closely.

First, there are the polarization concerns. If Centrist and Republican feminists give up on the Republican party, doesn't their action further polarize the nation? If there is not diversity and variety in both parties, aren't we inviting the inevitable ethnic, social, religious, and racial hatreds that we see in too much of the world? Does polarization help the cause of feminism or are we hurting our potential to grow?

The second set of concerns are inclusion concerns. Aren't we feminists giving up on a substantial number of political women if we don't participate in Republican primaries and conventions and in similar events dominated by the anti-feminist Democrats? How do we reach those women politically if we never help them fight their battles? And aren't we taking an enormous risk of being shut out in states where Republicans or anti-feminist Democrats are the majority? Look at the case of Pennsylvania headed by anti-choice Democrat Governor Casey who brought us the *Casey* case, which he inherited from Dick Thornburgh and which he chose to champion even more strongly than his predecessor.

Third, there are the maintaining-our gains-concerns. If feminist public policy gains from one party, how much do we stand to lose when our opponents win elections? How do we hold on to what we have won if we're only in one political grouping? Let us not forget that the American political system is decentralized to encourage diverse viewpoints and de-emphasize monolithic solutions. How do we protect ourselves against a repeat of those horrendous Reagan-Bush years?

All these questions are at the core of any philosophical debate about political power. We'll not solve them today, but it's worth considering more deeply one question: Does a revolutionary movement consolidate its gains and become more broad-based in its ideology as it wins power, or does it do better by keeping its base more narrowly focused? Or, put more simply, are we now secure with our modest power and mature enough to welcome centrists with their pragmatic and less ideological ideas into our movement? What about short-term practical considerations? (The ones that were talked about by Marie and Catharine?) They are in one sense easier to respond to in a political context.

The religious right led by Paul Weyrich and Pat Robertson seeks and is in some cases already using the Republican party for its own fascist ends, and I mean fascist. Ross Perot is on an ego-aggrandizing political trip heading toward the '96 elections. With a possible three-way split in the electorate, feminists from all political parties and all persuasions must help the President. The breaking off into a feminist third party will isolate us from the mainstream. We will be talking too often only to each other. With our energy directed at building a third party, money and resources will be siphoned away from local and state feminist candidates and causes. We will lose momentum with such an effort. Need I repeat what we already know? If we don't win elections, we won't have any political power. At least, *real* political power. We will have the kind of power we had before the modern women's movement. There will not be feminists wielding power if we squander what we have on a third party movement.

I remember many years ago my mother telling me that the highest flattery was imitation. How was I to know that the leadership of the Bush campaign would take the ideas of the feminist movement and twist them around and try to use them for their own ends? Last August I walked out of the Republican convention. I couldn't stand to

hear one more attack on women and families as though all of us in the feminist movement, all of us who had worked so hard, disliked families, disliked children, were against women, did not love our husbands, and on and on and on. Buchanan, Robertson, Bush, and both Quayles were too much. And I am also sorry to say that I was heartsick as I sat in my hotel room the night that Barbara Bush spoke. I had wanted to go home to New York. I couldn't get out of Houston so I sat in my hotel room and watched those speeches on Wednesday night. And, yes, Pat Robertson was outrageous. And Pat Buchanan on Monday had been outrageous. Marilyn Quayle was what Marilyn Quayle would always be. Marilyn Quayle should have been here with us. Marilyn Quayle is a very smart woman who somehow can't quite understand what has been happening to all of us over the last 30, 40, 50, hundreds of years. But the sad part to me was Barbara Bush, because Barbara Bush, who should have known better, was used in an unfortunate, and I think, despicable, way. And I sat there in my hotel room and I said, "That dream of mine, that dream about those two parties and feminists in both parties" -- yes, I realize it's a contradiction and I've realized it for years, but I also am an optimist just like Catharine. And I said, "I can't let this go on any longer." So I walked out and I faced what I didn't want to face, which was that as far as I was concerned, at least for the near future, my two-party dream was over. And many of my colleagues that I have worked with in the Republican feminist movement and many independent women feel the same way. Weyrich and Quayle and Robertson and the rest of those scoundrels will get no help from us under the guise of a so-called big tent.

But I am hounded by the polarization of America's politics. Do we really want a feminism that turns its back on mainstream women? Are we not strong enough now to embrace a more broad-based coalition? I remember when we founded the Manhattan Women's Political Caucus in 1972 down at the New School, or maybe it wasn't the New School, it was at P.S. 41. It's been a long time. And I remember getting up and saying that it was important that there be feminists in both political parties. You may remember Richard Nixon was president then, we were all tied up in hating the Vietnam War. Many of us were active in the anti-Vietnam movement, but we were Republicans. I stood up at P.S. 41 and I opened by saying, "I am a Republican woman." And most of the women in the room booed me. I remember Carol Greitzer - - some of you may know Carol Greitzer, she was a reform Democratic leader from the Village Independent Democrats, a very liberal Democratic club -- stood next to me and told people to be quiet, that I had a right to speak.

Well, it's 22 years later. Pro-choice Republican women are taken somewhat more seriously by feminists, but what has happened is that most of us are very tired, and we don't know whether we want to continue. As I said, we cannot turn our back on those mainstream women. I don't know the answer, but I know we must face the issue. We lost twice to Reagan and once to Bush because we didn't recruit and include those women -- and when I say "we" I mean the feminists. Ignoring them again will be our Achilles heel, at least in the political sense. Our opposition is cunning, and as I said about Houston, they cloak themselves in our words. They use "family," they use "life." As Kathy Spillar will tell you, they argue for freedom of speech as they stop

women from going into the clinics. They talk about their right to chose as they obstruct doctors from entering their place of business. They talk about freedom of religion as they attempt to impose their religion upon us.

Mainstream women don't know much about us. They hear our words through the likes of Helms and Dornan and Hatch and, yes, Casey and O'Connor. Our challenge is to welcome these women into the fold and at the same time maintain the hard edge of our goals. Yes, it is a balancing act, but balance is at the heart of any civilized democratic political system. For me it is the only way we can retain some peace and sanity in this unsafe world. And in the bargain we might increase our political power. We need to try to win over those mainstream women.

Thank you.

Faye Wattleton, Former President, Planned Parenthood Federation of America:
Now I have three hard acts to follow; no, five.

When we're tempted to think about these as unique times we can listen to the voices of Lucretia Mott, the abolitionist and Quaker, when in 1850 she wrote that:

"Let woman then go on not asking as favor but claiming as right the removal of all hindrances to her elevation in the scale of being. Let her receive encouragement for the proper cultivation of her powers so that she may enter profitably into the active business of life employing by her own hands, administering to her own necessities."

When thinking about the comments that I wanted to make to you today, I felt that those were very appropriate words because when we look back and think on these times as advancing the power of women, will we see them as times that we have employed our own hands to minister to our necessities? Or will these be times blighted by the continuing indifference (the indecency of that indifference) to our aspirations; our progress blocked by anger, by hatred, by violence? Will the gains that we have achieved in our struggles for social equality have been gains that are eradicated by the political process? Because in 1992, the year of the so-called Year of the Woman notwithstanding, our rights are more fragile than they were in 1980.

The America of the 1980s was an America in which class and privilege were exalted. Sexism and bigotry surfaced in shocking forms. Battles that we thought were fought and won on equality and racial justice were re-fought, and women were really quite at the center of the struggle. I must say that if the performance of the Clinton Administration is an indication, there will still be some battling to do, even though Mr. Clinton has taken some important steps to eradicate a number of the destructive policies of the Bush and Reagan years. But as we face those battles, I hope that we will not lose a sense of the lessons of history in that we must remember that the supporters of those policies are still very much with us here and now. And so it's very tempting to

get caught up in the blush of political victories and not understand that there continues to be an entrenched system that perpetuates the policies of repression against women and that continues to be with us. The prolonged battles to end the policies of hostility towards women and our rights, and the battles to end political exploitation of race and class which rose to outrageous proportions in the 80s are inextricably tied.

When we think about the ideology of our movement we must understand that we really are a part of a much bigger, larger social struggle for equality of many Americans. One hundred-forty years ago Lucy Stone wrote that the right to vote will be swallowed up, and the real question is whether a woman has a right to herself and that question applies to Americans of all races and socio-economic positions. She went on to say that, "It means very little to me to have the right to vote, to own property, etc., if I may not keep my body and its uses to my absolute right." But after 12 years of the systematic reconstruction of the federal courts the rights of women to keep our bodies and their uses has been seriously damaged. Damaged by 12 years of persistent battering of the promise of our Constitution's guarantee of equality, of justice, of privacy, of liberty. The courts have gone a very long way and we must deal with the reality that now the Supreme Court of the United States has invested in the presidency enormous powers that in 1980 it did not have, and those powers unfortunately have been at the expense of women.

We sometimes talk about the losses that we have sustained and the political reality of the last 12 years as though it was done by someone else, but the American people elected for three terms of office not one but two anti-woman presidents. How many of you in this room voted for Ronald Reagan and George Bush? How many of us did not work actively for their defeat? So we must take responsibility for where we stand. And further, take responsibility that things will not automatically change for the better because there is a president in the White House supportive of the issues that concern women. I say that very consciously -- the issues that *concern* women, not the women's issues. But let us not forget that we can't take for granted that the person who lives in the White House will do the right thing, or that he indeed will not, and someday that *she* will not, also make the wrong decisions and choices. Byron White is leaving the Court as an appointee of John Kennedy. Harry Blackman, one of the most liberal justices in the Supreme Court's history was Mr. Nixon's selection. So it's like Will Rogers said: That even if you're on the right track you'll get run over if you just sit there.

This is a time for important change. Change will need to be made in laws. Many steps will need to be taken to correct egregious errors of the past 12 years. But there can be no real change until this society truly comes to grips with the fundamentals, the fundamentals that women must be equal. There will not be real change until women take responsibility for that happening and take the leadership for our rights. We cannot assume that a male-dominated power structure will do it for us, and if we needed any evidence of that we can look to the Supreme Court nomination and confirmation of Clarence Thomas, a man who told us that he had not heard about, read about, or

discussed *Roe v. Wade* in 19 years, and we still confirmed him.

The name of the game will be politics. And there is no doubt that a profound change took place in the political landscape in 1992. But we can't take for granted that because we elected minorities and women that we will regain lost ground without the agenda of our concerns being pressed. Getting some women elected is only the beginning. Vigilance and a commitment to making sure that they do not get sucked up and caught up in the power of politics is our responsibility. We must never again underestimate the length to which the power structure, the political process, can be used against us to deny us our birthright not as women but as Americans to control the most private aspects of our lives and thereby our destiny.

We must not forget that the Supreme Court of the United States permitted the President of the United States to impose a gag order on women denying us the full right and access to our First Amendment. We must not forget that *Webster* stands as the living memorial of this Supreme Court's permission to establish religion in the law -- the violation of our first liberty, the right to practise the religion of our beliefs and not to have it imposed upon us by law or by preambles of the law. We must not forget that the Supreme Court of 1993 ruled that women's free right to travel could be impeded by outlaw vandals and that *Casey* was permitted by the Supreme Court to impose the process of thought and mind control on women. Discrimination of women by class, that is, the discrimination of minor women, was allowed by that great bastion, the protector of our Constitutional privileges, the Supreme Court. And most of all, we must not forget that there are some in this country who do not believe that Americans have the right not to be murdered if we disagree with their ideology.

At the same time that we engage political mechanisms to change the social infrastructure that is still aligned against women, each of us has a special obligation individually to work to create fundamental change and that can be an enormously empowering process. It does not take armies of thousands. As you leave here today think about, "What will I do by virtue of my choices and the way I conduct my life to empower another woman?" In Carol Gilligan's excellent book to which you have already heard reference, *Making Connections*, she describes how girls retreat from an early sense of power, subduing themselves in order to achieve social approval. She found that in adolescence girls experience a crisis in response to society's demand that girls keep quiet. They notice the absence of leadership of other women and so they keep quiet. What Dr. Gilligan describes as "creative aggression" is then nipped in the bud, and their ability to take on the world in the way that they see it becomes stifled for the sake of acceptance and approval. How many of us have not fought hard enough, and long enough, and vigorously enough for our rights because we were afraid of social disapproval? All of this stunts our ability to dream, our ability to grow beyond ourselves, and when lacking this self-esteem we are particularly susceptible to discrimination and abuse and violence. We are socialized as women to be nice and say that there are no problems. We must understand that when we move against the establishment, the traditional power establishment, we are working against our

conditioned instincts. We have to say that there is a problem and that problem is deeply imbedded in the attitudes of our culture and that we as women must not rest until it is eradicated.

Advancements mean that we will break the limitations on the traditional conventions that self-sacrifice is a virtue primarily for women. Elizabeth Stanton once told a reporter, "Put it down in capital letters, 'SELF-DEVELOPMENT IS A HIGHER DUTY THAN SELF-SACRIFICE.'" The thing that retards and militates against women's self-development is that we have been conditioned to engage in self-sacrifice. Leadership must be found not outside us but within each of us. And so you leave here today having identified one leadership characteristic that you can employ toward the advancement of women's equality. Advancement will require that we resolve not to compromise our commitment for social approval. Advancement will mean that we will not tacitly participate in maintaining the institutional structures that continue to compel women to be secondary. After all, we are 51 percent of the population and we ought to start acting like it.

Yes, there have been gains and much has been made and it is important that we make these great strides, but we don't yet have a steam-rolling momentous trend going here. The history is very much against us. Between 1776 and 1976 listen to these numbers so you see how much catching up we had to do: Men outnumbered women in the Senate of the United States by 1715 to 11; men outnumbered women in the House of Representatives 19,591 to 87; men outnumbered women 507 to 1 in presidential cabinets; and until Sandra Day O'Connor was appointed to the Supreme Court in 1981 there had been no woman on the Supreme Court in the 200-year history of this nation. Well, I suppose we can say it is something like 600 men to maybe half a dozen women now in the cabinet of the presidency. We must not rest until American politics reflects 51 percent as a reflection of the make-up and concerns of this nation. If we fail to become directly involved in the political process, we give in to those forces that have worked against us, and that means that we have to fight those same battles again that should never have been brought up let alone held up for contention and held up for debate.

I leave you with this final thought: Politically, power is never bestowed, it must be taken. Abigail Adams once wrote to John Adams in 1776, and I quote, "If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment rebellion. And we will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice." I sort of like the way Sojourner Truth commented on all of the struggle because I think she wrapped it up very nicely when she said, "If women want any rights more than they got, why don't they just take 'em and not be talkin' about it." Let's stop talking about it and take what is rightfully ours.

Kathy Spillar, National Coordinator, Fund for a Feminist Majority: Whither feminism? I'm very optimistic actually about the future course of feminism and the chances for gaining equality for women in our lifetimes. And I think I'm so optimistic because I think feminism is well positioned in our society. First and foremost, we're a very popular movement despite what we frequently see printed in the mainstream media and hear repeated day in and day out. In fact, as the Ms. Foundation survey has shown, and other surveys before it, the women's rights movement is a very popular movement with widespread support among women in particular but increasingly among men as well; and that in fact the majority of women in this country identify themselves as feminists, a shocking fact for many of us. It's why the Feminist Majority took its name when we formed in 1987: We wanted to remind people that feminists are the majority and that we are a popular movement. And we are a movement whose strength is drawn in many ways from our diversity. We are everywhere. We are a multi-issue and multi-tactical movement. There is an organized feminist movement in every aspect of our culture, in journalism, in government, in politics, education, medicine and science, law, business, sports, the arts, religion. I don't think there is a single aspect of our society and culture that you could name that I could not find the organized feminist movement within.

The real crisis is that in every area of our culture women, and particularly feminists, have virtually no power. We are under-represented in every decision-making body in this society. The most obvious, and perhaps the one that has been most frequently of late focused on, is the area of government and the area of politics. Despite the significant magnificent gains of last year we are still under-represented in Congress and in the state legislatures. In fact, at the current rate that women are gaining political power it will be another two generations before women have equal power in the state legislatures. And it will be more than two centuries before women will have equal power in the United States Congress. And I think we have long-passed left the argument over whether or not the representation of women where decisions are made makes a difference. I think Anita Hill dramatized it because it was so clear for everyone to see on prime-time television. But in fact much of the research that's been done by centers for the study of women and women's studies has been to show that women, in fact, make a significant difference when they're represented where decisions are made. The agenda changes. The focus of debate changes. The issues that are considered important change largely, of course, because we grow up in a very sex-segregated society. We grow up with very different experiences and, in fact, have very different lives than men.

I think that where feminism must focus is how to gain power and how to gain equal power, and there is only one way to measure equal power and that is when we count the number of women Congressional members and we count the number of women governors and when we count the number of women on corporate boards and on college and university boards of trustees and among tenured professors and among law partners and on and on. We should be able to count equal numbers of women and men in these positions. We can never be satisfied with only influencing power. The goal of

feminism must be to gain equal power.

Question and Answer Session

Q: I'm Phyllis Kriegel and I'm the Editor in Chief of *New Directions for Women* and I'm addressing this to anybody on the panel who would like to respond. Why, if we have an entrenched system that's bad for women, and why, if feminism is so popular, and why, if we have an information society where women need access and power, why is it so difficult to find support for women-owned, women-controlled media that put women at the center? Why are *New Directions for Women*, the *Getting-It Gazette*, and all the other small institutions having such a struggle? Thank you.

Stimpson: Phyllis, as an admirer and supporter of *New Directions for Women* I would first want to praise you and all that you have done and I would want to praise all the alternative media. We would have to ask another question as well, which is, is it only the alternative women's press that is having a hard financial time? Are the difficulties gender-marked? Or are the difficulties of the alternative small women's press and women's media the difficulty of any small outlet at a time when there is an increasing integration, an increasing conglomerization of the media? So, when I was talking -- as we talk together on this issue -- I would say, are you having trouble because you're women or are you having trouble because you're small or is it a nasty, nasty combination?

The next thing I would say in answer goes back to what Faye was saying and what Marie was saying and what all of us were implying, which is an even greater sense of responsibility for women's institutions not out of a kind of theoretical dedication to separatism, but out of a pragmatic dedication to the notion of women's spaces within the larger culture, women's spaces where energies can be concentrated, where ideas can be formulated, and that can serve as the citadel from which the battle is waged. That, I think, is one of the most pressing tasks in the 1990s, even greater dedication financially, morally, and in terms of energy to women's institutions, and here I think we have to praise presidents like Mary Maples Dunn of Smith College and Ellen Futter of Barnard College who have worked so hard to keep women's colleges going.

Wilson: I'd like to say something about both funding and media. I know Phyllis well and what she does, and that she and many others have struggled. I think it's fair to remember that less than 5 percent of all philanthropic giving in this country goes to women. That is an absolute outrage. The fact that the Ms. Foundation is the largest fund in the country and we're able to give away \$2 million a year, that's a great

amount in the world of women. But that is a small grant from a large foundation. And so, what I would say is that we have to figure out a way to fund our revolution that we've been talking about, and that's about women giving. It started last year when we started giving to political candidates. But women do have to give their money on behalf of women. If your daughter is watching, show her where you put your money and give it to women. So that's the first thing.

Now the second thing is about media. We have been very leery of media in this country. That's the other part of it. Does it *do* anything, whether it's small press, large press? You know -- it's like Faye said about the adolescent research -- if we're just good girls and do good, people will notice, it'll be fine, forget it. I had a man from CBS sitting on my couch the other day who has never talked to me and he came to talk about taking 9 to 15-year-old girls to work. And he looked at me and he said, "Isn't this just a media gimmick? Isn't this just a public education gimmick?" He said, "How is this going to help solve the fact that you're concerned about, about how many girls are victims of violence and sexual abuse?" And I said, "I've been telling you about these things for 20 years and this is the first time you're sitting on my couch." It drives me crazy and it won't be on television. *Take Our Daughters* is going to be on television all week. You won't see that part on television. But I think the other piece is that women have got to take control of media in this country. We have to own our own media and that includes *New Directions*, and we have to figure out how to get control of the media, that again the girls are watching and learning about what it means to be a woman.

Q: Traditionally the military and playing sports are routes for men to get into political power. I think of Jack Kemp and Bill Bradley as professional athletes and I think President Clinton is the first president not to actually have had a military career. Given this I was troubled that none of you mentioned women in the military and at best you have glossed over the role of women in sports. These are clear places where people can learn leadership roles. Also the military is going through a great deal of changes for women right now. I was wondering if you might be able to talk a little bit about this and what it means, what gaining more power in these areas means for younger women.

Spillar: I think the feminist movement has long focused on integrating sports and the military. They have been forefront issues and have really opened up doors of opportunity. Although clearly they are used by the male establishment, the male-dominated establishment, to keep power and to keep us out of power. There's no question about that. Tailhook provides a prime opportunity, I think, to raise a lot of the issues about how violence and sexual harassment and rape have been used within the military and within sports to keep women in their place. I think it's very important that we push for integration in those two areas, but that we also open up other avenues of gaining power, and, I think, expose sports and expose the military as having been

roads exclusively for men into power and encourage any activism in those areas. And I mention sports, but clearly there's a very strong feminist movement even within the military. And I think we're seeing some real breakthroughs and that the current gays in the military debate can help women because it has been lesbian-baiting that has been used far more often to kick women out of the military whenever they were approaching any kind of status at all in rank. Homosexuality has been used against men in the military, too. And I hope that this becomes a watershed period for this and that as people are appalled with the idea of keeping gays out of different areas of the military and combat that they will not forget the women.

Stimpson: I am very glad you mentioned the question of sports because when I sat down, feeling Leslie Calman's eyes burning in my back saying, "You've already done more than 9 minutes," I realized that I had not mentioned sports and the importance of enforcing Title IX. And the importance of sports not only as an arena of bringing in legal equity, but the importance of sports as -- forgive an old fashioned phrase in which I believe -- breeding character.

I think the issue of the military is more complicated. Women and men are torn, and it can be a creative tension but the tension is there, between asking for equity within all social institutions, including the military, or working in non-violent movements. People are going to make different choices on this. One thing I liked so much about your speech, Tanya, was the way in which you talked about a democracy being the question of balancing tensions. And I think on this issue of the military it is simply a tension that we will balance among us, between those of us who want equity in all our institutions, including the military, and those of us who seek to work for non-violence. It's there and there's no way out of it and let's learn how to talk about our tensions and live with them politically in a creative fashion.

Wilson: I'm going to preach about girls this morning, obviously, but I think it's important in terms of your question. What we know is that sports are really correlated with excelling in math and science, that sports are really correlated for girls with their ability not to focus on how they look. And if you went to the park right this minute you would see a cadre of men coming over the hills to teach their sons intensely how to have competence. And I really do think that's a major thing we have to focus on, how we get women and men involved with girls around that competence, because it is the place they can do something. So I think that's great.

I would also like to tell you that, to our great shock, the Colorado Air Force Academy and the Army of Virginia and these places are taking their daughters to work en masse. So what I am hoping is that the girls will show up at these places and say, "Eh?" I mean that they will have some comments about the military and kind of raise some consciousness. It's a tough issue, but we really do have to focus on the sports. It's too important.

Calman: I feel it incumbent upon myself -- I may be the only one here that knows this -- to inform you that Kate Stimpson played basketball for Bryn Mawr. She knows whereof she speaks.

Q: Hello, my name is Lisa Harven and I'm an attorney for the City of New York. I work with Child and Family Services. My concern is what the feminist agenda really is. I personally believe that all people are created equal and should have a fair chance at success and access to things that life has to offer, but I have a concern about women who may not believe that. And that has been part of the reason why I haven't joined fully in the feminist movement. I worked on Capitol Hill at various times in my life and I remember hearing the opinion of *Webster* being read by the Justices. And there were women on the Hill who got together after the reading of that opinion to strategize, to write a statute that would sort of guarantee a woman's right to choose. I remember feeling very left out. I remember being looked over, not really being part of the discussion, maybe because I was very young at the time or maybe I didn't look like the other women who were there or I just didn't embrace the same kind of cultural identity that they had. And I feel like I'm part of the newer wave of feminists. I'm a feminist but I still enjoy being a woman. I'm an attorney. I enjoy using my brain, but at the same time I feel a concern that the old guard, the old girl network, is sort of blocking, maybe, some of the new wave that might want to come in. And I really enjoyed hearing Tanya and Faye addressing those issues of having different ideas and opinions but being part of the family. I'm wondering if that issue has ever been a concern for anyone on the panel and how you'd address that.

Wattleton: We have all day to talk about this. You raise, I think, some really excellent issues, and considering myself a part of the old girl network (because I am an old girl, given the fact that this is my 50th year in 1993), when I hear the notion that somehow I'm a feminist but I do enjoy men and I do enjoy looking good I wonder if we haven't somehow miscommunicated in our ideology the breadth of the dimension of women. And that we have sometimes fallen into the trap of being perceived as having only one dimension to our personality as opposed to the fact that none of us are single-dimensional, not even those of us who think about sex and reproduction 24 hours a day! There are dimensions to us that are a part of our unique quality that is our gender. And I think what we heard from several panelists here is that we really have to exploit all of those qualities and not just some of those qualities, and that the society is better served when we recognize all of the unique qualities of being a woman and not shy from them. Even looking good is a great asset in this country, and I don't mean that in the feminist sense. I mean that there is a lot to be said about how we look in terms of what we convey about self-esteem to our children and how we value ourselves and what we consider to be important about ourselves, and we must first consider ourselves important before we can expect other people to consider us important and

valuable.

But I would finally like to say that I never came to this movement of believing in fighting for the rights of women because I waited for somebody else to ask me to participate. I found that there was enormous self-interest in my commitment and my involvement in this. Perhaps that came from my personal and professional background as a nurse where I saw who the women were who suffered the most, and they were not white affluent women, they were poor Black women. And so I feel that that power package resides within the hearts of each of us and we don't have to wait for other people to get aside for what we have to do for ourselves. But it really is a matter of pragmatic self-interest that we engage this movement in whatever way. That isn't to say that all women believe in what I have spoken about this morning, what all of us have spoken about, but that is to say that if those of us who do believe don't make this battle and don't make this fight, there won't be much left for any of us to believe because we will be so completely subjugated to the power structure, even more than we have in the past.

Melich: I agree completely with what Faye has said and I'd just like to add something to the point about being an outsider. When you are in a fight of the sort that feminists are in, trying to change something of such major proportion with such high stakes, people who are in leadership positions are like the generals in a foxhole. Even though the feminist movement tries very hard to take care of the privates and the corporals and maybe someone who just showed up who isn't even a private yet, it's very, very difficult. And for those of you who are now the young ones that are coming on, who are going to -- we all hope up here -- take on this leadership and move it into the next phase, you've got to be, I think, a little pushy and a little helpful and a little understanding of those of us who have been doing this for 30 years. And Marie's foundation with the *Take Your Daughters to Work* is providing something you will always have to deal with: the generational conflict. You will have to deal with that problem. Older people, men and women, don't like to give up power. But we will die out and it will be your turn. I'm being very pragmatic about it.

Secondly, I repeat myself, be pushy. It's the young women that come into the organizations that I work with that say, "Hey, I'd be glad to hang around another extra two hours." We're always looking for young women to help out, and we try to mentor them and move them along. So if you felt out of place in the context that you described on the day of the Webster decision, it was D-day down there, and I think that we all try -- "the old girls" -- to bring you in, and when we don't do it, then in your most appropriate way, you tell us and offer to help. We all want you there very much.

Q: My name is Anne Shapiro. I am a professor and I am inspired this morning by all of you, but I am also worried. So I want to tell you what I am worried about. The best selling woman's book this year was not Carol Gilligan's latest book, but Susan

Faludi's Backlash. I guess that was actually last year. And what I worry about is something I'm seeing here. That is, are we preaching to the converted? There are almost no men in the audience. I'm happy to see a few of them, but I'm seeing here what I see in my own women's studies classes, women. And that's wonderful, but I think if we're going to win this revolution we will have to speak to men. So I would be curious to know what strategies all of you have for getting our message out to the men, who may be only 49 percent but they're a powerful 49 percent.

Melich: I have been asked that question many times and what I find is that the feminist men are very supportive. They give us their money. They sit in the meetings. They put us on the panels. But there are very few of those feminist men who will do the kinds of things that all of us on this panel have done and many of you in this room have done. Many years ago at the Manhattan Women's Political Caucus organizing meeting I was the one who wanted the men in. And as many of you remember, we fought for that for a couple years. When we formed the Pro-Choice Republican movement we insisted that there be men on our board. However, there were more women than men. The fact of the matter is except for those men whom I mentioned, this is a women-driven movement, and as many times as we try to include the men, they're not really interested. Certainly in the group that I deal with, which is the centrist mainstream part of the dialogue, and certainly within the last couple of years, they only became interested when our women's political movement began to take a little power away from them. While I have been married to the same man for 30 years, and I have good relationships with the men in my life and the feminist men on our committees, this is our movement. I'm sorry they're not here, but I'm really more glad that all of you women are here. This is an adversarial fight, a revolution. Maybe 20 years ago I thought, "Oh, wouldn't it be wonderful to have the men involved," I wanted them as our allies. But it is ours to win and ours to lose. Don't ever forget that we are talking about taking power. They're not going to give it to us, even those wonderful feminist men are not going to give it to us.

Stimpson: Tanya, you said what I think I was probably too timid to say, but...

Melich: Catharine, you are not timid.

Stimpson: But let me just build on what you said and let me speak to my fellow professor. The education of men in the women's movement has always gone along on two levels. One has been the private level and one has been the public level and it is extraordinary in that way. And I think that we have to always remember and always honor millions and millions of women, who without any recognition and often at some physical risk to themselves, educate the men in their lives, educate their fathers, educate their fathers-in-law, educate their uncles, educate their sons. And I very much

agree with Marie about the necessity of educating sons as well as daughters on a private level. On a public level I think feminism has worked very, very hard to establish many different voices. And I think it is a tribute to feminist writers, such as Letty Cottin Pogrebin, Alice Walker, Elizabeth Janeway, Susan Faludi, Jane O'Reilly, Barbara Ehrenreich, that they have made a very real and conscious and deliberate effort to reach a mainstream audience. Also, I feel an enormous personal debt to Faye and to Gloria Steinem because of their brilliant, brilliant appearances on television. And, in fact, I think if there's a way in which our educational efforts have not been as successful as they might have been it is that we have been stronger in print than we have been on T.V. And Faye you are unique and Gloria is unique. I wish there were more of you at the same time. But I think we have tried.

The question -- and here I'm building on Tanya -- the question is how do you speak to the deliberately deaf? And if the fathers are deaf, speak to the sons. And I do see the sons listening on college campuses.

Calman: By a remarkable, fortuitous, coincidence: Sir?

Q: Yes, for Tanya Melich: what direction do you see the Republican Party taking? Do you think we'll see a repetition in '96 of the kind of right-wing take off that we saw at the convention this year? And if it does happen, if the right wing seems to be permanently ensconced in charge of the Republican Party, how can you continue being Republican?

Melich: You didn't hear my speech.

Q: I did. I did.

Melich: I'm sorry I didn't make it clear. To the first part of your question: The Republican Party's base at the moment is in the Southern, smaller Midwestern and Rocky Mountain states. The question is what happens in places like California, which has a Republican governor, Pete Wilson, who will be challenged by Kathleen Brown. You know in Massachusetts it's Governor Weld; in Illinois, Governor Edgar. But what I'm saying is that the Republican Party, much more than the Democratic Party, usually works their nominating processes through the power bases of several governors. There is little grassroots organizing. And the Party's grassroots at the present time is mainly in the hands of the Christian Coalition, the Pat Robertson people, and some of the -- what would we call them? -- the Quayle people. And one of them, Phil Gramm of Texas wants to run. So what am I saying? I'm saying, in those large states where you have governors like Weld, Wilson, Edgar, will those men be re-elected in '94 and if

they are, will they represent a power base large enough to balance with what is in the rest of the Party? What I think will happen is something that happened in '66 after the '64 elections. Some of these centrist governors will be elected, but there will not be enough of them. The new national party chairman is essentially a right-winger who talks about wanting a big tent to let everybody else in, but I am suspicious of his tent. There will be an enormous fight, and in the final analysis, the same group that was in power in '92 will be in power in '96. Except, if Weld, Wilson, and some of those others win in '94 there could be a fight in '96 where there was not a fight in '92, but they will not be successful. The Christian Right-Quayle faction has the most power. Now as to my own personal approach on this, I told you I thought very clearly that people like myself are going to have to help President Clinton with the various kinds of federal agendas that are coming. On the state and the local level it depends. The organization that I represent has already decided to endorse Rudy Giuliani because they think that his positions on women are fine. But as far as the national level is concerned, my colleagues across the country feel that we do not want to see the fight split between Perot, a right wing Republican, and Clinton, and we will do what we can on the national level to help prevent that.

Now, beyond '96, because of what I said about being haunted by a national polarization with a far-right and a far-left party, while our system doesn't quite work that way, I worry. I can't become a Democrat and I won't become a Democrat, but over the long haul, I don't know what I will do.

Q: I'm Miriam Freidlander, former (NYC) councilwoman. Talk about politics. I think, first of all, this whole session has been fantastic and everybody who's here is a real feminist and I'm having an active experience about being a feminist because of the wonderful panel that you have here today. So I just want to say thank you first.

But I would like to raise a particular question. I know that a lot of people here feel very separated from political life. They don't know how to touch it, how to connect with it, how to deal with it. There are other people who feel, "Oh, I'm only interested in issues. I don't want to touch politics." Because they say "politician" and spit twice, you know? So I just think you are raising the serious question. We just had a wonderful experience of how to improve political representation in the Congress, both Senate and the House. Can we bring this experience, this wonderful lift that we had in the past year, to our local scene?

To wit, I want to raise two aspects. One, we are being faced with an attack against primarily women and women's rights by the Roberston group in the elections that are going to take place for the school boards. How can we participate more between now and May 4th to really do a major struggle against the worst elements in their attacks on women? The second aspect is that you have the ability to do more about your city council this year. All of them will be up for election for this coming election year and you can get started now. How can you be in touch to make sure that your principals

and your rights in a strong active struggle will be represented? Could you just touch on those two aspects of local elections which many of us never get around to? Thank you.

Spillar: I think there is a great deal to worry about in this round and particularly in New York City. The Christian Coalition is supplying the research and in many cases the candidates, but it's my understanding that Cardinal O'Connor has hooked up with the Christian Coalition and, in fact, Catholic churches everywhere are going to distribute their literature on who is the endorsed candidate of the religious right wing.

One key facet in gaining political power for women is a long-standing problem: there are not enough of us running for political office. We can win if we decide to run. We can raise the money. We can gather the campaign workers in. I think we've proven that. A key problem is that not enough women are running, and I think that all women's active groups have got to get focused on recruiting and helping to recruit and encouraging women to run for office. It is the focus that the Christian Coalition has taken. They are actively recruiting and forming very grassroots networks. It only takes a few votes to win in reality. I think we've all been tricked into thinking that it's the general not the primary that counts in most cases and that it takes a lot of votes and a lot of money to win these cases. In reality even congressional races come down in many, many cases to just two or three thousand votes. We've got to, I think, do more of the research, get the information out, and actively recruit feminists to run for office, and obviously then support them once they're running. It's a key part of this whole effort that has been largely missing over the last several years. We've instead focused on targeting our resources. We've been told, in fact, by the male political establishment that that is the savvy political thing to do, to target your resources. You should only run for one or two offices and put everything you have into those two races. We should have women running and feminist women running in every race, everywhere, at every level because this is not a science. I think political science is a bit of a misnomer. In many cases it is luck and being there, standing there when the guy next to you falls. So I encourage you all to become active in recruiting and many of you, in fact, to become candidates.

Melich: I would just add to what has been said, that not only being active and being candidates but also being informed because the last round of elections in California at the school board level demonstrated the stealth candidate concept. That is, getting candidates on the ballot whose positions were not really known and established and articulated before the election and getting them elected on a low-key basis because it doesn't take huge numbers to win a local school board or a local city council.

Q: I originally came up with one question, but I have to do it as a two-part question. One is to Ms. Melich. Regarding that throw-away remark that your group is supporting Rudy Guiliani for Mayor of New York City -- I don't know how you ever

came to the conclusion that he would be good for women. And you can tell me that as soon as I finish, but let me just get my other question in. The other thing is directed to Marie and to all of you, I suppose. In the last 20 years of feminism we rarely hear about how pervasively the negative visual images of women are being communicated. We live in a society in which visual images probably have the biggest impact on everyone from the youngest children who are watching Sesame Street to the old people sitting in nursing homes looking at television all day long. Marie Wilson's question about girls seeing these images of women and her suggestion about putting up billboards is wonderful. Do you think we could really indeed do such a campaign, not only billboards but PSAs and newspaper ads. Your newspaper ads, by the way, for bringing the girls to work have been very good. But I'm wondering if there are ways we can force it. I know it's a lot of money but I'm wondering if there are ways we can force institutions to use those public service announcements in all media to be able to get a real campaign across about what we are seeing about women. Not only our girls, but what is everyone seeing about women's images?

Melich: The Republican Pro-Choice PAC Committee met with Rudy Guiliani in two or three different meetings that lasted several hours each. We asked him every question under the sun related to reproductive health issues. At the conclusion of those meetings we were all convinced that he was staunchly pro-choice, he would protect the rights of poor women and young women in the City of New York, regardless of what happened at the state and federal level, and as a result of those discussions the Committee voted unanimously to endorse him. And I'm part of that committee.

Q: What about the Catholic Church and Rudy Guiliani?

Melich: I'd be happy to talk to you about that later. That question was asked. Those are privileged pieces of information in the sense that there were 7 or 8 of us in that room. Questions about -- and Kathy who has been on the frontlines of these clinics, the whole recent Lincoln Services clinic problem -- those problems related to the protection of the clinics of New York were dealt with. We addressed the question of the Catholic Church, and we all felt that as the mayor he would do everything he could do to see that women had access to those clinics, that they would be protected from Randall Terry's Operation Rescue people, and Joe Scheidler's group, and that women would have the kind of protection that we felt they were entitled to.

Wilson: One of the things that's really good is you can be in a group of women now and have public disagreement and I think girls will be happy to watch us have these disagreements and will learn from them.

One thing I love, that ad campaign that you are referring to is a campaign that says, "If

all she's ever told to be is a good girl, how will she grow up to be a great woman?" And it has different women who are grown up and what they looked like as young girls. I do think that media has made a great difference and we have had people come up to us and say that just reading that ad reminded them about what they were told and what they want not to do anymore. They're tired of being good girls. So I completely and heartily agree. I guess I want to put a plug in for Lifetime Television. By the way, we were not able to raise one dime for advertising. Not one dime. Everything you see around the country in terms of advertising was donated. So getting a campaign like this done is enormously difficult, but I think if those of you who know Lifetime, they are very into this now. And I think they might be willing, with a little encouragement, to produce some things that then will get picked up by national television. So call Lifetime.

Q: My name's Arlene Kessenbaum and my question is specifically to Kathy Spillar but also for the panel in general afterwards. You mentioned that one of the new strategies is gender balance laws, and I wanted to know what is your strategy to fight against the predictable attacks from the conservative spokespeople that these would be quotas?

Spillar: Quotas. It's what absolutely comes out of the mouth every time when we start talking about gender balance laws and gender balance rules. The reality is that we have quotas. Right now there's a quota in the United States Congress that guarantees that 90 percent of those seats are filled by men. And on corporate boards there's a quota that 97 percent of the seats are filled by men. What we want are rules that open up the whole selection process of who gets to serve in decision-making positions, recognizing that under-representation guarantees, in fact, that better ideas are not represented around those tables. And we want rules that guarantee that women are going to be represented in proportion to our numbers in the population. And I think, frankly, that the men, if they were really smart, would start going for this because eventually they're going to want to guarantee they get their 49 percent. But it's true. It's always what's used against us. I think we've got to turn it on its head and say there already are quotas. There were quotas in the military until we got Title 9. There were quotas in the universities. We want a guarantee of equality and there's only one way to do it and that is to change the rules because the rules were made to keep us out not to put us in.

Wattleton: I would only add to that that as a member of a group with another characteristic -- that is the color of my skin -- that is very often charged with being unreasonable about demanding a fair share, that we've come to the position that we are willing to accept the charge that we're looking for quotas. Because if it means rectifying a gross injustice it is the tradition of this nation that whatever mechanism is necessary to achieve that must be our agenda. We should not be turned aside by charges from those people who abuse them and design them to intimidate and to

frustrate our goals and our aims. When we allow them to do so we really allow them to undermine our power. So we shouldn't shrink from quotas, from affirmative action, from "you've got to have your fair share," and all of those things. I'd like to have a discussion about that when there is a more reasonable representation of all groups in this country at all levels of our institutions.

Parts of Catharine Stimpson's remarks have appeared previously in:

ACLS Occasional Paper #20, 1993

and

The 1992 Proceedings of the National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries.

[Faint, illegible handwritten text, possibly a signature or scribble]