

CHAPTER 2

Personal Politics

Revolutionary Survival: Lesson One

*More women
Should throw
More dishes
At more walls
More often*

—UNSIGNED, NOVEMBER 1970¹

IN THE MID-1960S, most Americans hardly knew there was such a thing as feminism. The postwar era's emphasis on suburban domesticity, early marriage, consumerism, and high fertility produced a generation of women only vaguely aware that there were issues worthy of discussion regarding the place of women in society.² Yet the terrain on which they lived their lives was changing at a remarkable pace, pulling their experiences increasingly out of line with the words and concepts available to describe them. The pressure that built up in this disjuncture explains much of the explosive force of the women's movement in the late sixties and early seventies, and that energy, like a tsunami that carries the force of an ocean floor earthquake, seemed to flow in all directions at once.

In 1963 Betty Friedan in *The Feminine Mystique* described an aspect of this dilemma as "the problem that has no name." Virtually every powerful cultural institution—magazines, television, advice books, schools, and religious leaders—prescribed a middle-class ideal for

women: they were to be wives and mothers, nothing more, nothing less. Friedan called this ideology the "feminine mystique" and went on to describe the isolation of suburban life for highly educated women whose child-rearing years were largely over by their mid-thirties. They enjoyed a life filled with "labor saving conveniences" but also isolated from what many thought of as the "real world." Suburbs gave a new, geographic twist to the old split between private and public, family and work, personal and political. The work suburban women actually did, inventing new forms of creative motherhood and elaborating networks of volunteer institutions, was not seen as, well, *real* work. Invisibility, lack of definition, and barriers to entry into the (male) public world left millions of women to cope with a nameless private anguish.³

The privatized definition of the suburban housewife also operated as an all-pervasive force limiting the possibilities and aspirations of additional thousands whose lives no longer conformed to the tenets of the feminine mystique. The dramatic expansion of education and service industries in the aftermath of World War II created millions of jobs for women. Married women entered the labor force faster than any other group in the population through the fifties and sixties, earning incomes that made it possible for their families to enter the middle-class world of home ownership, automobiles, televisions, and higher education for children. They met open exclusion, however, both from higher paying blue-collar jobs and from managerial and professional occupations. Female-dominated jobs, such as clerical work, were ghettos that offered less pay and fewer opportunities for advancement. Until 1963 it was perfectly legal, and very common, to pay women less than men for exactly the same work on the presumption that only men were breadwinners.

The silence imposed on women was a source of pain and confusion in many women's lives but most acutely in the lives of educated women, who received contradictory and ultimately unresolvable messages about their lives. The small but growing minority of professional women in the 1950s faced a lonely struggle. Maria Iandolo New, Chief of Pediatrics at Cornell University Medical College, remembered decades later the chastising words of a medical school dean in 1950 in response to her plea that her application be judged on its merits and not dismissed be-

cause she had married. "You are an impertinent young lady, and I am more sure than ever that we do not want you in our medical school." Major law firms routinely rejected female applicants like Ellen Peters, first in her class at Yale Law School in 1954, and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, first at Columbia in 1959 and later a Supreme Court Justice. In 1957, Madeline Kunin, a student at Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, applied for a newsroom job at the *New York Times*. She was offered a job in the cafeteria. Kunin later served three terms as Governor of Vermont and was President Clinton's Deputy Secretary of Education. While these women persevered, many dropped out when professors announced that "women don't belong in graduate school." Those who persisted hid their pregnancies and paid careful attention to dress and demeanor. Male colleagues encountered in professional settings routinely assumed that the white women present were secretaries, and black women, domestics.⁴

A new generation, raised in postwar affluence, flooded colleges and universities in the 1960s. Many recalled bitterly that they had no idea what their work should be or how to imagine themselves as adults. Their lives were rife with mixed messages. Certainly they knew they were supposed to marry, have children, age gracefully, and enjoy grandchildren, but their actual life choices included college, graduate school, and professional expectations. "In my generation," as philosopher Sara Ruddick put it, "women's work histories were so buried in our life histories as to be barely visible." Unable to write her dissertation while her husband pursued his first academic job, she wrestled with an indescribable "pain of worklessness." "I had learned to think of life as a matter of personal relations, to think about myself as a daughter, wife, friend, and lover. I knew more about myself as a mother, more about babies even before I ever had children, than I knew about myself as a worker."⁵

In June 1967, Marilyn Young, a recent Ph.D. in history, confided to her diary, "How ineffective. I shall live out the rest of my life as if it weren't really happening and then die surprised . . . I have no proper work, and for me that is hard. And I grow lazier, mentally, by the hour." She remembers her life then as happy for the most part, caring for small children and playing the role of faculty wife. Her own Ph.D. in history

was just "money in the bank," insurance. "Much later, in a women's consciousness-raising group, I spoke the bitterness of those years. But I . . . I wasn't angry *then*."⁶ For such women there was " . . . an invisible, almost amorphous weight of guilt and apology for interests and ambitions that should have been a source of pride," a sense of an unvalidated life.⁷

Women with graduate degrees were still a small minority, but it is easy to detect broad changes in behavior that show millions of women, and men, making choices that no longer conformed to dominant cultural values. The trend toward younger marriage reversed; by the mid-1960s people married later and more of them not at all. The introduction of the birth control pill, which had weakened the link between sex and marriage, also helped accelerate the falling fertility rates as the "baby boom" vanished precipitously. Married women and women with children continued to enter the labor force in massive numbers. Those who dropped out to bear and raise children devoted fewer and fewer years to child care as an exclusive occupation. The flood of young women into colleges and universities was matched by a rising tide of older women returning to continue and complete educations suspended in the 1950s. Millions, then, knew that something was amiss, that they should have more than just a private life, but few could give it a name or link individual experiences to give form to their collective grievance:

When women's consciousness-raising groups began to spring up everywhere, these were the women who walked in the door and immediately felt at home. In later years they talked about the "click," that moment of naming after which the world looked and sounded and felt different—crystal clear and infuriating.⁸ In thousands of ways they immediately set out to *do something*, and their actions surged through the landscapes of American daily life.

THE SPECIFIC ORIGINS of the second wave of feminism in the United States lay in the experiences of two cohorts of women, predominantly middle-class, who came to feminist activity with different but complementary perspectives. The older group were professionals involved in the networks surrounding federal and state commissions on the status of women. The younger branch of feminism grew among activists in

the civil rights and student movements of the 1960s.⁹ Both groups were deeply inspired by the civil rights movement that from the mid-1950s had offered a model of people consigned to the margins of American society, who nonetheless laid claim to their full rights as citizens and in the process enriched and redefined the meaning of American democracy. Each had also learned the skills of public life and developed a belief in gender equality in the sixties through their involvements in government commissions on the status of women and the civil rights movement itself.¹⁰ Then, having discovered their own capacity for public action as women, each found the remaining power of patriarchal structures and mores intolerable. Together they moved to create a new wave of feminist activism.

The founders of NOW came together through a network of government commissions on the status of women. When President Kennedy appointed a national commission in December 1961 and state governors followed suit in subsequent years, they unwittingly facilitated an organized revolt.¹¹ Professional women on such commissions, or commission staffs, explored and documented the broad patterns of discrimination each had experienced in her own career. Empowered to think about and recommend policy changes, they enjoyed a period of community building and political consciousness-raising, only to discover that as insiders they could do little without organized pressure from the grass roots.

Similarly, young women in the civil rights and student movements engaged in passionate, and sometimes courageous, action in the name of egalitarian ideals. Breaking the middle-class rules of female decorum as they organized for voter registration, taught in freedom schools, and joined demonstrations likely to land them in jail, they discovered themselves as political actors, acquiring the necessary skills as they went along. In the civil rights movement they were immersed in a community long bowed down by racism and grinding poverty but that vibrated with a new sense of rights and collective power. The eloquence and raw courage of southern black leaders, many of them women, contributed to the sense that the vision of a "beloved community" of black and white together was worth risking one's life. Every community, for exam-

ple, had its "mamas." One SNCC worker wrote that "there is always a 'mama.' She is usually a militant woman in the community, out-spoken, understanding, and willing to catch hell, having already caught her share." He gave the example of 70-year-old "Mama Dolly" in Lee County, "who can pick more cotton, 'slop more pigs,' plow more ground, chop more wood, and do a hundred more things better than the best farmer in the area." These were the same women who risked their lives to register to vote, who mobilized their friends and neighbors to do the same, and who housed and fed white civil rights volunteers at great cost and danger to themselves.¹² The movement was infused with the conviction that the beloved community was more than a distant ideal, it was already visible in the ways they lived their daily lives. When it came to relationships between women and men, however, such egalitarian ideals did not always hold. Too often women found themselves expected to perform the "housework" of the movement, to assume clerical tasks, and to remain outside the limelight. In that contradiction, they found a new voice, claiming for themselves as women the ideals of radical egalitarianism.

THE FEMINIST CHALLENGE owed much of its subsequent shape and character to the broader political climate surrounding its birth. The late 1960s was a time when many saw themselves as "making history" in apocalyptic ways. Popular cultural images of "the sixties" often draw from these years when despair and utopianism fed on each other. The civil rights movement had taken a black nationalist turn, expressing the rage of urban black youth by indicating a willingness to use violence in self-defense and emphasizing racial solidarity. The horrors of the Vietnam War dominated the national news as they reshaped both radical and mainstream politics, even bringing down a president when Lyndon Johnson announced he would not run for reelection in 1968. The assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy shook the nation. By 1969-1970, the student movement, never particularly well organized, began to implode, turning against its own national organizations (Students for a Democratic Society, University Christian Movement, and even the student YMCA) amid hypermasculine revolutionary

and militaristic rhetoric: "shut down the Pentagon," "stop the war machine," "days of rage."¹³

At the same time, however, assassinations, the inhumanity of war on nightly television, and urban riots contrasted with hippie gatherings, called be-ins or gentle Thursdays, and images of long-haired youth placing flowers on the bayonets of National Guardsmen. Young men as well as women playfully resisted the constraints of gender in hair, dress, lifestyle, and nonmarital sexual expression. That those same young men also referred to women as "chicks," relegated them to housekeeping tasks, and accorded them status based on relationships with male leaders only fueled the rage those women were so shocked and empowered to discover within themselves.¹⁴

"Equality" and "liberation" were the demands that launched the second wave of women's rights activism. Both slogans challenged the ways women had been differentiated from, and subordinated to, men, but the first drew on the liberal discourse of equal rights and the second proposed a cultural and ideological transformation in which sex roles would be eliminated. "Equality" made a reasonable, liberal request for legal and economic equity; "liberation" raised a set of radical demands about culture and subjective identity.¹⁵

EQUALITY . . .

WHEN THE FOUNDERS of NOW huddled over lunch at the closing session of a Conference of State Commissions on the Status of Women in 1966, they determined to found a grassroots civil rights lobby for women whose goal would be "to take action to bring women into full participation in the mainstream of American society now, assuming all the privileges and responsibilities thereof in truly equal partnership with men."¹⁶ The NOW statement represented in some ways a modernized version of the first declaration of women's rights in Seneca Falls, New York in 1848 by reclaiming for women the republican ideals of equal participation and individual rights. The founders of NOW included author Betty Friedan, Dr. Kathryn Clarenbach, head of the Wisconsin Status of Women Commission, Caroline Davis and Dorothy

Haener from the Women's Department of the United Auto Workers (UAW), and African-American lawyer Pauli Murray, coauthor of a landmark article on legal discrimination, "Jane Crow and the Law." Mary Eastwood, Murray's coauthor, and Catherine East were critical players behind the scenes who had linked Betty Friedan with key people across the country and pressed her to assume public leadership of what would become NOW. These women's experiences on both state and national commissions had made them experts on legal obstacles and other forms of public discrimination against women. Soon NOW mounted campaigns for strengthening and enforcing federal antidiscrimination laws: picketing against the continued existence of sex-segregated want ads; pressuring the administration to include sex on the list of discriminations prohibited for federal contractors and for enforcement of Executive Order 11375; and insisting that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) enforce Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of sex as well as race, religion, and national origin.¹⁷

Despite this shared agenda, there were differences of emphasis among early NOW members. When NOW endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in November 1967, founding members from the United Auto Workers had to resign and withdraw the use of union offices and mailing facilities until they could successfully change their union's anti-ERA position (which they did in 1970). Another group left in 1968 when NOW formally endorsed legalized abortion, fearing such a position would interfere with their primary interest in employment and education discrimination. That group founded the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL). NOW leaders worried that the two organizations would compete, but one of the founders of WEAL, attorney Elizabeth Boyer, assured NOW that her organization would not compete for members but would draw in new, somewhat more conservative constituencies so that the two organizations could continue to work as allies.¹⁸

The spreading networks of overlapping memberships, which sustained NOW, WEAL, and in 1971 the National Women's Political Caucus, included from the outset a significant number of African-

American women in leadership positions. These were professional women who had long worked with white women on such issues as civil rights, poverty, and labor union activism. They could rely on the mutual respect that grew from shared work. Aileen Hernandez, for example, was the only woman appointed to the first Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (created by the 1964 Civil Rights Act to handle complaints of discrimination), where she became convinced that the Commission could not enforce the law against sex discrimination without pressure from the grass roots. She was elected president of NOW in 1970. An even more flamboyant figure was Florence (Flo) Kennedy, who had been a feminist at least since Columbia Law School rejected her application in the late 1940s on the grounds of sex. She gained admission by threatening to sue on the grounds of racial discrimination using what she referred to as the "testicular approach," applying "the right kind of pressure to the appropriate sensitive area."¹⁹ Active in NOW and then in more radical groups and a founder of the National Black Feminist Organization in 1973, Flo Kennedy was beloved by the movement and the media for her colorful and outspoken feminism.

These African-American women and others, such as Pauli Murray, Elizabeth Koonz, Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor in the Nixon Administration, Addie Wyatt of the Amalgamated Meatcutters Union, Ruth Weyand, Associate Counsel of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE), and Dorothy Nevels, a founder of Federally Employed Women in 1968, had come of age in the 1940s and 1950s when professional women of any race were highly unusual. They had battled first for access to credentials and again for the most minimal forms of opportunity and recognition. They knew firsthand the realities of both racial and sexual discrimination, and it does not appear to have occurred to them that they should choose one over the other to fight.

... AND LIBERATION

IN CONTRAST TO the NOW and WEAL focus on equality in public life, the radical branch of the women's movement placed private life at

the center. The women's liberation movement, as it quickly became known, had little use for formal politics or detailed policy discussions in the first year or two. Its founders saw themselves as revolutionaries. Their model was black separatism, and their driving passion was fury at cultural definitions of women as secondary, inferior sexual objects. Like the feminist foremothers in the 1910s, they mounted a sweeping challenge to cultural definitions of womanhood and femininity. Their first skirmish, in fact, was with an older generation of activists in Women's Strike for Peace (WSP), who opposed war in the name of motherhood.

WSP had represented a revival of the maternal feminism of the suffrage generation and a link to progressive activism from the thirties and forties. An organization of middle-class housewives with progressive, activist leanings, Women's Strike for Peace was founded in 1961 at the height of the Cold War. Proclaiming their concern for peace in the name of mother love, their actions were harbingers of women's reentry into political action in the name of womanhood, but their categories clashed headlong with the passionate proclamations of younger activists. In January 1968, under the banner of the Jeanette Rankin Brigade, named in honor of the first woman in Congress and the only Congressperson to vote against American entry into both world wars, WSP organized an antiwar demonstration of several thousand women in Washington, D.C.²⁰

"Radical women," the term "women's liberation" would soon follow, began to meet in small groups in Chicago and New York in the fall of 1967. At a planning meeting for the Brigade held in Chicago by WSP, members of the newly formed West Side Group showed up to express their disagreement with any claim that women's authority derived from their roles as "wives and mothers." The president of WSP, Dagmar Wilson, was on the whole very supportive of the new feminism and hoped that the younger radicals would join their march. The gulf in rhetoric was insurmountable, however. Longtime peace activists simply could not understand the fierceness of women's liberation's rejection of traditional roles. Younger women were utterly unmoved by their point of view, considering it merely another capitulation to societally designated roles. The only self-respecting position from which one could op-

pose the war, they insisted, was that of citizen or person.²¹ The Chicago and New York groups decided to attend the Jeanette Rankin Brigade demonstration to proclaim their opposition to any representation of women that depended on their relations with men and to invite other radical women to join them in their new endeavor. New York women came with props (a coffin and banners) to announce the "burial of traditional womanhood." Kathie Sarachild (note the newly created matrilineal name) offered an oration in which she argued that it was necessary to bury the traditional woman because

... [W]e cannot hope to move toward a better world or even a truly democratic society at home until we begin to solve our own problems. . . .

Yes, sisters, we have a problem as women alright, a problem which renders us powerless and ineffective over the issues of war and peace, as well as over our own lives. And although our problem is Traditional Manhood as much as Traditional Womanhood, we women must begin on the solution.

We must see that we can only solve our problem together, that we cannot solve it individually as earlier Feminist generations attempted to do.²²

A contingent of about 500 then broke away from the march to discuss this new movement and immediately fell into harsh debate, a harbinger of discord that marked one facet of this turbulent movement from the outset.²³

In the places where New Left activism remained strong, radical women clashed over their yet undefined goals and methods. Were radical women organizing themselves within a broader coalition of students and antiwar activists, or were they in the process of breaking away to create something utterly separate? Who would be their primary constituency? At what level did they expect changes to occur, and how would they bring these about? The bitter arguments that raged into the early seventies reflected the pain many felt as they faced open hostility and ridicule from men they had associated with, as well as growing desperation and internal self-destruction of the New Left itself.

Some women felt they had little to lose in breaking away. Others believed that their identities (as well as personal relationships) were at stake. Ellen Willis put it bitterly: "We were laughed at, patronized, called frigid, emotionally disturbed man-haters and—worst of all on the left!—apolitical."²⁴ Those who were clearest about breaking completely with what they called the "male-dominated left" called themselves radical feminists and labeled their opponents "politicos." The latter was an unfair designation and the "politico-feminist split" was less a split than a debate in most places. A different theoretical and organizing perspective ultimately evolved from the politico side of this discussion, calling itself socialist feminism.*

The growth of the women's movement thus depended less on specific ideas than on the ability of women to tell each other their own stories, to claim them as the basis of political action. By 1968 the women's liberation movement was clearly separate from the antiwar movement and such discussions had been named "consciousness-raising." They began as a spontaneous occurrence among activists with experience in either civil rights or the student New Left. Women with roots in those movements understood that to act politically against injustice involved personal transformation, and they believed that any movement for change should exemplify the values it sought to bring to the society as a whole. In civil rights this vision was embodied in the idea of "the beloved community" of black and white together; in Students for a Democratic Society it was the ideal of "participatory democracy" and, finally, in the rebellious counterculture, the goal devolved into a more anarchistic response to the impositions of societal authorities: "do your own thing."

Women who met initially to discuss the problems they were having as women within the student movement poured out their own stories and listened in amazement as others described the same patterns. The anger and energy this storytelling unleashed created an opportunity to redefine the world using their own lives as a template. Pam Allen, a member of an early San Francisco group, described women's liberation

* See the extended discussion of socialist feminism in Chapter 5.

groups as a "free space" where women could "think independently of male-supremacist values." Early members of New York Radical Women (Kathy Sarachild, Anne Forer, Carol Hanisch, Elizabeth Sutherland Martinez, and Rosalyn Baxandall) christened the procedure "consciousness-raising." True to their New Left heritage, they were inspired by stories of women in the Chinese Revolution who "spoke bitterness" to develop collective support for change.²⁵ As one radical feminist group (Redstockings) put it in their manifesto,

We regard our personal experience, and our feelings about that experience, as the basis of an analysis of our common situation. We cannot rely on existing ideologies as they are all products of male supremacist culture. We question every generalization and accept none that are not confirmed by our experience.

Our chief task at present is to develop female class consciousness through sharing experience and publicly exposing the sexist foundation of all our institutions.²⁶

Remarkably similar processes can be found in groups that were less eager than Redstockings to discard *all* received wisdom, seeing themselves rather in the context of a broader left and drawing on the Marxist-feminist theories then emerging in Europe. In Bread and Roses, for example, a Boston women's liberation group that formed in 1969 (about the same time as Redstockings in New York), founders recalled,

When our group started, . . . it was a wonderful time to be in the women's movement. It may have been a unique moment. It felt then almost as though whatever stood in our way would be swept away overnight, with the power of our ideas, our simplicity, our unanswerable truth.²⁷

Consciousness-raising was an intense form of collective self-education. "It seems impossible that adults have ever learned so much so fast as we did then. We taught each other sexual politics, emotional politics, the politics of the family, the politics of the SDS meeting."²⁸ Another

Bread and Roses member, Jane Mansbridge, said: "We had the feeling that we were, like Columbus, sailing at the edge of the world. Everything was new and intense."²⁹

Throughout 1968 and 1969 the women's liberation movement grew at an accelerating rate. The belief among movement founders that they were starting a revolutionary process was confirmed by the overwhelming response they met at every turn. It was not necessary to have well-developed organizing skills: just to say the words "women's liberation" seemed to be enough. No one was keeping a list—and many groups existed without the knowledge of others nearby—but the experience in city after city was that groups would form and multiply almost effortlessly. In some places, like New York City, where the movement tended to be highly ideological, multiplication often looked like sectarian hair-splitting. Alice Echols and others have described how New York Radical Women spawned WITCH (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell) and Redstockings, which in turn spawned the Feminists. What was really "radical?" Were women's rights, outside a broader left coalition, necessarily "bourgeois" and "reformist?" Or was the left itself a captive of patriarchal thinking? If "women's liberation" was the only truly revolutionary movement, what defined its radicalism? How could it escape hierarchy? Were sexual relationships with men a form of consorting with the enemy? The solutions were not clear, but it was the energy of the debate and the passion with which participants engaged these new ideas that spilled out into dozens of mimeographed articles, manifestos, newsletters, and, by 1970, journals, including *Notes from the First Year* (New York), *Up from Under* (New York), *No More Fun and Games* (Boston), *Women: A Journal of Liberation* (Baltimore), *Voice of the Women's Liberation Movement* (Chicago), *Ain't I a Woman?* (Iowa City), *The Voice of the Women's Liberation Front* (Chicago), *It Ain't Me Babe* (Berkeley) and its spin-off paper, *The Women's Page, Everywoman* (Los Angeles), *Tooth and Nail* (Bay Area), *Sister* (Los Angeles), and *And Ain't I a Woman?* (Seattle).

From the outset, this movement was led by young women in their twenties, veterans of sixties activism. Women's liberation groups appeared on virtually every large campus, to be sure, but they were equally

represented off campus. Numbers are difficult to come by, but without question by 1970, women's liberation was on the tip of everyone's tongue and the initiators were in a mad struggle to find the head of the parade!

At this explosive stage, however, cracks appeared between radical activists of color and white activists. Many women's liberation groups, for example, emulated the rhetoric of black nationalism, a politics of identity that emphasized separatism, 'familial analogies ("sisterhood"), personal storytelling, and sameness. They were oblivious to what Shirley Lim calls their "social capital," the shared networks, language, and experience that made calling a meeting easy and intimacy among strangers almost immediate.³⁰ They also believed, with some reason, that militant black women were not interested. Like others in the white New Left, many women's liberation groups supported the Black Panther Party, oblivious to its virulent sexism, which was only recently described by women in the party, such as Elaine Brown and Kathleen Cleaver.³¹ Thus it is ironic, but not really surprising, that radical feminist groups were overwhelmingly white—even more so than their liberal counterparts.

In the summer of 1968, when radical women met to plan a national gathering for the fall, they debated a proposal to invite the participation of black women by contacting Kathleen Cleaver of the Black Panther Party. Yet, one participant argued successfully against such an overture by drawing on her own experience in welfare organizations, where militant black women "set the tone and they manage to completely cow white women. . . . I understand the problem. But they hold the cards on oppression . . . and they let white women know it. I don't want to go to a conference and hear a black militant woman tell me she is more oppressed and what am I going to do about it."³² In fact, radical white women could not imagine a way to reach out to feminists in racial minority groups because of their own definitions of "militancy" and the authority they accorded separatist black leaders. They were oblivious to the existence, for example, of a group of black women in Mount Vernon and New Rochelle, New York, who by 1969 were actively engaged in an analysis of the problems facing black women in the economy, in the family, and in the movement. In a series of passionate papers they an-

nounced that "It is time for the black woman to take a look at herself, not just individually and collectively, but historically," rejecting their "black brothers[]" . . . continual cautioning that we must not move on our own or we will divide the movement. . . . [B]lack revolutionary women are going to be able to smash the last myths and illusions on which all the jive-male oppressive power depends."³³

Most militant black women were also oblivious to the existence of black women's liberation groups, and they quickly perceived the women's liberation movement as white. Fearing co-optation, subordination of the goals of black liberation, and division between women and men in the black movement, many black women expressed disdain: "I don't think any of them are real people involved in anything real. . . . God only knows what their goals are. To me, maybe a lot of publicity for White women to say aren't we great." That many militant black women also expressed a level of empathy, identification, and support for the specific goals of economic equity and elimination of sex discrimination in employment was obscured, however, by their overwhelming emphasis on racial solidarity.³⁴

Indeed, given the strong focus on racial group identity in the late sixties and early seventies, it is not surprising that activist women of color began to challenge the men in their organizations at about this same time, but their organizing rarely reached across racial lines, even to other women of color. Within the Chicano movement, for example, women began to hold workshops at least by 1969, but feminists were immediately stigmatized. "Women's lib" and "women's libbers" became epithets used to characterize Chicana feminists "as man-haters, frustrated women, and 'aggringadas,' Anglo-cized."³⁵ In 1969 at a Chicano Youth Conference in Denver, the workshop on women reported its consensus that "the Chicana does not want to be liberated." Nonetheless, pressure to address women's issues continued to grow. In 1970, a women's workshop at the Mexican American National Issues Conference in Sacramento voted to create the *Comision Femenil Mexicana*, an independent organization. Their founding resolution stated that "the effort of Chicana/Mexican women in the Chicano movement is generally obscured because women are not accepted as community leaders ei-

ther by the Chicano movement or by the Anglo establishment."³⁶ They immediately set out to work on such issues as child care (both legislation and establishing centers), abortion, establishing communication with government agencies to give voice to Chicana concerns, and setting up opportunities for leadership training. Like other small groups, "it has also infused more humor into [members'] work. Now, they can laugh as well as cry about personal problems. A means to discuss anxieties, fears, ask questions that could never be asked of others is available through members of the organization."³⁷

Through 1970, Chicanas organized women's workshops and caucuses at numerous conferences and Chicano journals planned special issues on women, despite continuing criticism.³⁸ When Jennie Chavez wrote an article about Mexican-American women's liberation in the University of New Mexico student newspaper, she "caught more shit than I knew existed from both males and females in the movement." Nevertheless, she organized a women's group, Las Chicanas, that grew strong despite ridicule.³⁹ This ferment culminated at the first national conference of Chicana activists in Houston, May 1971, when 600 women gathered, eager to discuss their roles in the movement and to create an agenda for Latinas. About a third of those attending, however, defined themselves as "loyalists" not "feminists." One participant recalled that "... the fears of being associated with non-movement activities hung over the conference like a confusing and disorganizing paranoia" until the loyalists finally walked out, protesting a resolution declaring that "traditional roles are, for Chicanas, no longer acceptable or applicable."⁴⁰

Similarly Asian-American women and American Indian women began to analyze the problems facing women in their own groups and to organize despite accusations that to do so was divisive. Asian-American students who met in an Asian studies seminar at Berkeley started a group "to critically examine and discuss our roles as Asian women. Significantly, our efforts have been met with enthusiasm, hostility, curiosity, understanding, caution, relief, anger, joy and always—controversy." Out of their discussions came a journal, *Asian Women*.⁴¹ Specific historical realities, however, made it difficult to identify broadly with all

women. Not only were most minority women attuned to racial solidarity, but also their responses to specific issues, such as the family or abortion, had a different resonance in each group. The writings of Asian-American feminists, for example, articulate the difficulty they faced in overcoming their own socialization in a culture that overtly devalued women and inculcated values of obedience and filial piety. The daughters and granddaughters of immigrants whose parents remembered internment camps during World War II and lives of harsh and menial labor, they also resented the economic privileges of most women.⁴² Native American women, by contrast, spoke about their heritage of ancient traditions of female power, which had been eroded by the imposition of white forms of government; families that had never been small and nuclear; and issues regarding land, education, health, and sheer survival. Their women's organizations in the 1970s defined their mission in relation to the Indian community as a whole.⁴³

Thus, although within 2–3 years there were women's caucuses, workshops, journals, and/or organizations in virtually every racially identified group, the women's liberation movement continued to be perceived as predominantly white. In contrast to racial minorities, white women, as members of a racial majority, were the norm, rarely thinking of themselves in racial terms, and they felt no pressure to sustain a political connection based on shared oppression with white men. As a result they found it easy to identify themselves with "all women" and to assume that their analyses and ideas could and should apply to all. "Intimacy and mutuality," as Shirley Lim has pointed out, was premised on "exclusivity."⁴⁴ In such a situation the difficulties facing any interracial coalition of women were profound, and they shaped the subsequent evolution of the women's movement. Those who made a serious effort to work on issues of common concern usually stumbled.

Barbara Grizzuti Harrison described an attempt to work across racial lines among parents at a school in Brooklyn in 1971, who organized a "sex roles" committee to press for curricular change: "When black women attended Sex Roles Committee meetings, those meetings were occasions for bewilderment, acrimony, anger, and pain. We wanted a feeling of solidarity with black women, both because it was an emo-

tional necessity for us, and because we deemed it a tactical necessity to present a united front to the school. But the differences between black women and white women were so profound that goodwill, kindness, and intelligence were not always enough." White women idealized black women, imagining them to be united and strong. Black women were not really all that united, but they did share a deep anger toward white women, whose solicitude seemed condescending and who didn't really see racism as the most important issue. Interactions were difficult. In the face of black women's anger, white women remained silent, acquiescent. Vulnerable to the criticism that the women's movement was white and middle class, "we needed the black women . . . to assuage our guilt and to disarm our critics."⁴⁵

When Harrison interviewed several black women at length, she discovered some of the issues and realities that undergirded their anger: "My mother took care of rich white kids." "I didn't think they were oppressed; I thought they were cowards."⁴⁶ Another woman pointed out that white women's capitulation was part of a useless rhetorical dance: ". . . you people got sucked in every time. Why did you fall all over yourselves when guilt was laid on you? . . . When black women are doing their thing by showing off and whites do their thing by accepting guilt, we're nowhere."⁴⁷

Feminists of color had to wage a lonely struggle to find a feminist voice of their own in these first years. Fran Beal founded the Women's Liberation Committee of SNCC in 1968. She recalled shivering in a Harlem doorway in the winter of 1970, gathering courage to give an invited speech to ". . . a group of nationalists who preached that the demand for women's rights was a white plot to divide the black Liberation Movement, that abortion was genocide, and that women should be supporting the men's new-found 'manhood' by walking ten steps behind. I was the designated hitter and felt as if I was about to become the main attraction at a metaphorical lynching party." She gave her talk, and "[w]hile no one called for my head, no one stood and supported our views. As I exited the room, however, two young women whispered to me, 'Right on, sister.' I never forgot those quiet expressions of support. . . ."⁴⁸

Among college and university students in the late 1960s, however, the YWCA offered a space for unity of black and white women, primarily around issues of race. Renetia Martin was a student at Berkeley in the late 1960s. The black student movement she found there discouraged women's leadership. The student YWCA, however, was a women's organization that linked her to an older generation of black female leaders and the possibility of interracial discussion. Black women in the YWCA, under the leadership of Dorothy Height and Valerie Russell, were already wrestling with the meaning of black power, and they organized a separate meeting before the YWCA National Convention in Houston in April 1970. Young women (17-35) also held a separate meeting, and Renetia, Chair of the National Student YWCA and therefore a leader in both, became a pivotal figure in pushing adult blacks toward militancy while winning the active support of young women of all colors. When the formal conference opened, 2,700 women, "all kinds, all ages, all shapes, all sizes," met in a hall hung with banners "for peace, for justice, for freedom, for dignity." Young women declared their activism and their discomfort with religious labels, naming themselves Young Women Committed to Action. All 500 black delegates stood as their report was read, demanding that the fight against racism become the singular focus of the YWCA. In response, the convention adopted the One Imperative: "To thrust our collective power toward the elimination of racism wherever it exists and by any means necessary." Everyone present still remembers slender, militant young Renetia Martin pronouncing her benediction: "In the name of Malcolm, Martin and Jesus—Power to the struggle."⁴⁹

Following the convention, Renetia returned to Berkeley where, through the auspices of the campus YWCA, she began to organize personal support groups for black women. The demand for such groups was huge, and the women who came were filled with pain. These were, in fact, consciousness-raising groups, but they did not go by that name and they remained primarily focused on personal support rather than political action.⁵⁰ Black nationalists had made the reclamation of "manhood" a centerpiece of the black movement by the early seventies.⁵¹ They were perhaps the most vociferous, but similar attitudes also pre-

vailed in the Chicano movement, the militant American Indian Movement (AIM), and Asian-American civil rights movements as well. Black feminism had no room to breathe. Consciousness-raising was about all that could be done.

THE ENERGY OF INTERNAL conflict was the flip side of an immense creativity unleashed by the women's movement between 1967 and 1975. In these heady days, the women's movement was decentralized in the extreme. Unaware of historical precedents, they replicated the brilliant "Do Everything" policy of Frances Willard in the 1880s. As President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Willard announced that local chapters would choose their own focus. Unconstrained by national priorities that were either too radical or too restrictive for their own taste, the WCTU chapters rapidly became a major force for progressive reform, stretching their opposition to alcohol and immoral male behavior to include activism in behalf of children (founding kindergartens and the PTA), working women, female prisoners, and even suffrage.⁵²

Similarly, NOW's structure encouraged the creation of "task forces" at the local and national levels on virtually any topic. These, in turn, issued a string of reports—on sexism in education, legal discrimination, or violence against women—with recommendations for action. Eleanor Smeal recalled that "We were not real philosophical in those days [the early 1970s in Pittsburgh]. We became instant experts on everything. On child care. Started our own nursery school. We worked on employment cases. . . . First we started organizing local NOW chapters. Then we organized the state. I went to every village and town, organizing; if you have just one or two people, you can get a chapter going. I organized housewives. Because that's where I was. You have to do what you know. It never occurred to me that we weren't going to get housewives, and we did: We have."⁵³

Women's liberation, with its antistructure, antileadership, "do your own thing" ethos, spawned thousands of projects and institutions. Most of those actions will probably never be recorded precisely because they were so spontaneous and ubiquitous. Jan Schakowsky, for example, was aware of the women's movement in 1968 and 1969, but as a suburban

housewife she had no idea how to get involved. With two kids in diapers, "I felt totally trapped." But she found time to read about feminism between diaper changes and at naptime. "By the time my husband walked in the door all hell would break loose. He was responsible for all the evils of the world and especially responsible for keeping me trapped: What kind of person was he? Didn't he understand?" She felt supported by "all those unseen people" she was reading about. "I knew that if I ever met Gloria Steinem we would be best friends." Her first consciousness-raising group was a consumer action group she and her neighbors formed in the early 1970s. They initiated a meat boycott to protest inflationary prices and spent their meetings discussing their problems as women "and the kinds of changes as women that we had to go through in order to face those things."⁵⁴

The accelerating spread of the women's movement finally caught the national media's attention in 1968 and 1969. Between January and March 1970, substantial stories on the movement appeared in virtually every major journal and broadcast network.⁵⁵ Media attention tended to be condescending if not hostile, but the powerful message overrode its medium. Indeed, the zeal of feminists was fed in equal parts by their optimism that an egalitarian world was possible and by the hostility and derision they met at every turn. They may have felt, initially at least, that they were simply claiming a birthright, the opportunity to pursue their own dreams and to participate as equals in public and private life. But leftists shouted at feminist speakers, "Take her off the stage and fuck her!" and on ABC News a senator called women's liberation a bunch of "braless bubble heads."⁵⁶ *Time* took note of the new movement with the claim that "the radical women have opened a Pandora's box. But that of course is their birthright. They are her direct descendant." *Time* announced 4 months later that ". . . last week the movement scaled new piques. . . ."⁵⁷ When the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Equal Rights Amendment in August 1970, the *New York Times* editorialized on "The Henpecked House," and James J. Kilpatrick described the ERA as "the contrivance of a gang of professional harpies. . . . [M]en who voted for this resolution had but one purpose in mind, to get these furies off their backs."⁵⁸ In general, media coverage

sensationalized and mocked women's liberation with nicknames like "women's lib" and "libbers."⁵⁹ One editor was known to have instructed a journalist to "get the bra-burning and karate up front."⁶⁰

No bras were burned at least in the early years, when the "bra-burper" epithet appeared, although one of the organizers of a demonstration against the Miss America Pageant in August 1968 suggested ahead of time to a journalist that they might be.⁶¹ Instead, participants tossed "objects of female torture" (girdles, bras, curlers, issues of the *Ladies Home Journal*, and so on) into a "freedom trash can," auctioned off an effigy of Miss America ("Gentlemen, I offer you the 1969 model. She's better every year. She walks. She talks. She smiles on cue. *And* she does housework."), and crowned a live sheep.⁶²

Only 2 years later, proliferating groups and media coverage had made the new feminism a major topic of national debate. Many mainstream institutions faced feminist insurgencies from within as well. Sheila Collins described herself "as one of those odd birds; an aroused woman, and also as a former seminary student now a minister's wife and the mother of two preschool-age children. . . ." In 1969, she and several other women in the New York Conference of the United Methodist Church "formed a task force to discuss the 'woman' issue and to influence our church to take some kind of action in regard to women's liberation." Their concern, like that of numerous other small groups interested in sex role socialization, was to analyze and to challenge the images of girls and boys that dominated their denomination's Sunday school curricula. "The church must repudiate once and for all the unchristian formula of male superiority-female inferiority. . . . [It] can begin to join the revolutionary age by taking a second look at its own literature."⁶³ Soon after that the national magazine of the Methodist Student Movement, *motive*, published one of the earliest collections of women's liberation writings in a special issue edited by Charlotte Bunch and Joanne Cook.⁶⁴

When NOW called for a "women's strike" on August 26, 1970 in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution granting women the right to vote, the national scope of this new movement became visible to activists and observers alike. Its insistence on the politics of personal life were likewise

on display as women took action under the slogan: "Don't Iron While the Strike is Hot." *Life* magazine reported that

. . . in Rochester, NY, women shattered teacups. In Syracuse they dumped 50 children in the city hall. In New York City, Boston and Washington thousands marched and rallied and hundreds more held teach-ins and speech-ins in dozens of other cities. Women's liberation is the liveliest conversational topic in the land, and last week, all across it, the new feminists took their argument for sexual equality into the streets. . . .⁶⁵

In New York City between 20,000 and 50,000 women staged the largest women's rights rally since the suffrage movement, blocking Fifth Avenue during rush hour. Theatrical and humorous actions abounded: a guerrilla theater group in Indianapolis portrayed the middle-class female life cycle from "sugar and spice" to "Queen for a Day"; Boston women chained themselves to a huge typewriter; women in Berkeley marched with pots and pans on their backs; New Orleans reporters ran engagement announcements under photos of future grooms; stewardesses carried posters challenging discriminatory airline rules (about which they did, in fact, successfully sue): "Storks Fly—Why Can't Mothers?"⁶⁶

THE CONTAGION OF FEMINISM lay in its ability to touch women at a deeply personal level, politicizing matters that were previously taken for granted as "the way things are." When *Newsweek* published a cover story on the women's movement it hired a freelance writer, having rejected versions by the few females in the ranks of reporters and editors. The day the cover story reached the newsstands, however, a group of women on the staff called a press conference to announce that they had filed a sex discrimination complaint with EEOC. At that time all but one of the *Newsweek* research staff were women; all but one of its fifty-two writers were men.⁶⁷

Sophy Burnham laughed when she received an assignment from *Redbook* to do a story on the women's movement. "A lunatic fringe," she thought. But "within a week I was so upset, I could hardly focus my

ideas." In 4 months of listening to women's anger, pain, and quest for identity, "chords were struck that I had thought long dead. . . . I thought I had come to terms with my life; but every relationship—husband, child, father, mother—was brought into question." By the end she was a convert: "I am now offended by things that would never have bothered me before. I am now a feminist. I am infused with pride—in my sisters, in myself, in my womanhood."⁶⁸

The wide spectrum of feminist activism that existed by 1969–1971 in many cities attracted a broad range of women. NOW and WEAL chapters (and in 1971 the National Women's Political Caucus) attracted middle-class professional and semiprofessional women who had experienced discrimination in employment and in the political arena. These were women who were ready to jump in and work systematically both in the courts and in the legal system. Radical groups, in contrast, drew first on a constituency of New Left activists. Consciousness-raising also drew in women who were attracted to the idea of a women's movement but who came with many questions about whether women were really oppressed and in what ways. These two modes of organizing soon overlapped.

For example, Iowa feminist Bev Mitchell recalled, "I became a feminist in 1971 when I went to Chicago for a weekend with my someday-to-become-ex-husband. We were just two Nebraskans gawking at the big buildings. There was a women's liberation rally in Grant Park. It was just about the most exciting thing I had ever been to. It was also scary. I remember one woman dressed in nothing but the American flag. Her fingernails were three inches long and she had a sparkly top hat. It was fabulous. It was the first time I had ever been to a speech or a political rally where I agreed with every single point, or it was something I had never thought of before and in the next twenty minutes I mulled it over, and said, 'Yes, that is true.'"

Back in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, she joined several other women she had met in graduate school in Cedar Rapids to form a women's liberation group. When they learned another group had met the same week, the two joined forces. The second group had been convened by the (then) wife of a major industrialist in Cedar Rapids. The combined group included prominent, powerful women and countercultural leftists alike.

When they learned that the Cedar Rapids civil rights code omitted women altogether,

Sally Madden and the other important women went on a rampage. They just said, 'You will do this.' They were supported by the scary, hippie women, . . . women dripping with beads. Remember that the eleventh commandment of waspdom is, 'Thou shalt not make a scene.' We used this as a tool. The men on the [civil rights] commission were not used to seeing blue-collar women. They were scared to death that between their wives, who were capable of incredible fury, and these hippies, God knows what would happen. So protection for women was put in the code.⁶⁹

This group went on to desegregate lunchrooms with sit-ins and set up child care, self-defense, and women's medical self-help classes; they "made honest men of the media by having a Summer Camp Bra-Burn, two weeks of tent/trailer lakeside encampment for women and children. . . . Every morning we raised a bra on an improvised flagpole while a member . . . played 'God Bless America' on her kazoo." After the passage of Title IX, a member of the school board sent a carefully marked copy of the Cedar Rapids school system budget anonymously. With compelling evidence of disparate expenditures on sports for girls and boys in hand, they filed a successful Title IX complaint. In 1973 the group agreed to affiliate with NOW, primarily to prevent an anti-ERA woman from forming a chapter there, but they kept their original name, Cedar Rapids Woman's Caucus.⁷⁰

Music and the visual and performing arts were also part and parcel of the women's liberation movement from the outset and a major form of consciousness-raising outreach. Women's liberation rock bands emerged in Chicago, New Haven, and Austin determined to "take the sexism out" by writing new words and tunes and by doing everything (playing instruments, serving as sound technicians, and moving equipment) rather than being only vocalists.⁷¹ Women artists responded to the movement with a new sense of their work and their audience. In 1969, painter and sculptor Judy Chicago began to describe her own work as using explicitly female

imagery "to show that the subject matter of my work is my identity as a woman." She and other artists felt released by the women's movement from striving for neutrality (or at least avoiding work that could be viewed as "feminine"). "Until the Women's Movement came along, I felt unable to say that my work was not about plastic or color but about my investigation of my vagina as a metaphysical question."⁷² In 1970, Chicago announced an exhibition at California State University Fullerton and her legal name change (from a married name that she never actually used) with a photo of herself as a prizefighter, lolling in her corner of the ring with brazen arrogance. The announcement read: "Judy Chicago: a name change and an across-the-board feminist challenge."⁷³

For many feminists, art became one way of building the movement, and the focus of women's art was intensely personal and self-reflective: consciousness-raising in another medium.⁷⁴ At their show in New York entitled "Women's Art" in 1971, Vivian and Emily Kline focused on daily, domestic objects: a clothesline, bridge cards, a lace tablecloth, chocolate candy, a mop, pink curlers, Tampax, a corsage, a bridal veil. They made them gigantic—a 12 foot mop, a 6 foot Tampax—as conceptual art. Dozens of other artists took up the themes of personal exploration, using images of childbirth to represent women's oppression as well as women's creativity. The result, for observers, was a participatory experience "of doing instead of just being, . . . [of looking] at ourselves with sympathy, not shame. . . ."⁷⁵ By 1975, Lucy Lippard could argue that conceptual art as a whole had been redirected by women. "The turn of Conceptual Art toward behaviorism and narrative about 1970 coincided with the entrance of more women into its ranks and with the turn of women's minds toward questions of identity raised by the feminist movement."⁷⁶ Playing with identity, an artist like Martha Wilson photographed herself as a man and then as a man dressed as a woman. "Art-making is an identity-making process . . . I could generate a new self out of the absence that was left when my boyfriend's ideas, my teachers' and my parents' ideas were subtracted."⁷⁷

CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING WAS most powerful in the first 5 years of the women's movement. With CR groups, women discovered that their ex-

periences were not unique but part of larger patterns, and they discovered female community. They named themselves a sisterhood, a familial metaphor for an emerging social and political identity that captured the key qualities of egalitarianism, love, and mutual responsibility. Because the groups had little or no structure, they could be formed anywhere, from offices to churches to neighborhoods. At meetings, women discovered that the personal issues of daily life—housework, child rearing, sexuality, etiquette, and even language—could be political issues susceptible to collective action and change. Nothing was beyond discussion.

This spreading debate soon infected informal female networks, such as office and neighborhood friendships, religious groups, and other voluntary associations. The new feminism necessitated extensive redefinition of roles, attitudes, and values because the traditional definitions of women and men were so at odds with women's actual experience. Feminists argued vehemently about whether the division between public and private was universal or particular to American society in recent times and whether women were essentially different from or the same as men. The heat of their debate opened new windows on women's lives as individuals and as citizens and marked the difficulty of devising new categories for their changing reality.

At first, whatever anyone tried, the movement grew. The liberal desire to battle discrimination in the legal arena, the radical feminist insistence on awakening a female "class consciousness," and the socialist-feminist attraction to community organizing—all "worked," and each reshaped the other. NOW task forces on working women, for example; by the early seventies found ready allies among women in emerging socialist-feminist groups interested in organizing clerical workers.⁷⁸ Similarly, NOW task forces on health and education paralleled and sometimes joined forces with such efforts as rape crisis hot lines or curriculum reform generated by women's liberation groups.

Yet the radical feminist experiments with extreme forms of democracy, some of them quite rigid, created problems that pervaded all branches. Any activist who received media attention, for example, was likely to be dubbed a "star" and urged to step aside so that other women could share the limelight. Some groups sought to equalize participation

in discussion by passing out tokens. When anyone spoke she used one of her tokens, and once the tokens were gone she had no more access to the floor. Similarly, groups that insisted that they would have no leaders quickly succumbed to what Jo Freeman (founder of the West Side Group in Chicago) later called the "tyranny of structurelessness," in which leaders denied their own roles and groups found themselves incapable of holding anyone accountable.⁷⁹

Nonetheless, as women analyzed and politicized the embodied experience of being female and the supposedly "natural" familial roles of wife, mother, and daughter, they also invented new institutions and modes of public action. The range of these actions illustrates their energetic belief that anyone could take action and could make history. Feminists politicized issues relating to the body (rape, violence, abortion, and sexuality) and to the family (marriage and child care) simply by following through on intuitions and patterns discovered in the process of consciousness-raising. Little could they know in these early years that cultural issues like abortion, "family values," and sexual preference would etch deep and lasting fault lines in the American body politic.

THE POLITICS OF THE BODY

From the beginning, feminists focused on highly intimate subjects. Groups analyzed childhood experiences for clues to the origins of women's oppression, they discussed relations with men, marriage, and motherhood, and they talked about sex. Frequently, discussion led to action, and action on one topic led to another. For example, in an early meeting of New York Radical Women, several women described their experiences with illegal abortion. For most it was the first time they had told anyone beyond a close friend or two. A group of women, subsequent founders of Redstockings, then decided to disrupt a legislative hearing scheduled to hear testimony from fourteen men and one woman (a nun). Claiming that women who had experienced abortion were the "real experts," they demanded to testify. When the legislative committee refused to hear them, they held a public "speak-out" on March 21, 1969, drawing an audience of 300.⁸⁰ Thousands of women,

hearing about such speakouts, joined in. Journalist Gloria Steinem recalled that "For the first time, I understood that the abortion I had kept so shamefully quiet about for years was an experience I had probably shared with at least one out of four American women of every race and group."⁸¹

Women's liberation groups thus made themselves the "shock troops" of abortion rights, joining an already active abortion law reform movement.⁸² For the most part they offered public education alongside services and assistance to women rather than lobbying for reform. Numerous groups, for example, began to assist women seeking illegal abortions to find competent doctors. Word of mouth usually resulted in a flood of requests. In Chicago, members of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union began offering counseling and referrals in 1969, continuing work done by Heather Booth with help from some members of the West Side Group. Calling themselves Jane, they began to shift in late 1970 from making referrals to doing the abortions themselves. By the time they disbanded in 1973, abortion collective members estimate that they had performed over 11,000 illegal abortions with a safety record that matched that of doctor-performed legal abortions.⁸³

At about the same time that "Jane" arose, a consciousness-raising group made up primarily of graduate students and writers for an underground newspaper in Austin, Texas also shifted its focus to abortion referral. They built an alliance with local members of the Clergy Consultation Service on Abortion who maintained close contacts with doctors to ensure high-quality services, and by 1973 they referred more than 6,000 women. In September 1969, sitting around at a garage sale to raise money for the group, Sarah Weddington, a recent law school graduate, discussed with another group member the legal risks of their activities and volunteered to do some legal research. That research revealed that outside of Texas, where the law forbade abortion even in cases of rape and incest, judicial and legislative precedents offered reason for hope. Thus began the process that resulted in the landmark Supreme Court case, *Roe v. Wade*, in which Sarah Weddington argued her first case at the age of 25.⁸⁴

Sarah Weddington's small group had initially formed in the fall of

1969 to discuss a pamphlet entitled "Women and Their Bodies" by a women's health collective in Boston. The collective had formed as a result of a series of discussions about female sexuality within Bread and Roses. Inspired to gather information about women's health, they named themselves the "doctor's project." They first created a recommended list of female gynecologists, then moved on to teach a course and to write the pamphlet that found its way to Austin. Even after the demise of Bread and Roses, this group continued as the Boston Women's Health Book Collective and formally published a revised edition of their pamphlet as a book, *Our Bodies, Ourselves*. Still in print, the book demystifies medical expertise by giving women direct information through personal stories and narratives stressing women's sexual self-determination.⁸⁵ Similarly, Anne Koedt's paper, "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm," and the enthusiasm elicited in early workshops on sexuality, made understanding orgasm and learning to masturbate regular items at consciousness-raising sessions. One of the most common memories of such groups revolves around the moment when one woman confesses that she had faked orgasm; one after another would acknowledge the same.⁸⁶

Efforts to increase women's sexual autonomy frequently sparked concerns about the problem of sexual violence as well. Cell 16 in Boston made headlines with its advocacy of female celibacy (which never really caught on) and karate for self-defense (which did). One of the classic realizations in CR groups had to do with the sexual objectification and vulnerability of women in public. Meredith Tax, a founder of Bread and Roses, described the daily experience of young women:

A young woman is walking down a city street. She is excruciatingly aware of her appearance and of the reaction to it (imaginary or real) of every person she meets. She walks through a group of construction workers who are eating lunch in a line along the pavement. Her stomach tightens with terror and revulsion; her face becomes contorted into a grimace of self-control and fake unawareness. . . . What they will do is impinge on her. They will demand that her thoughts be focused on them. They will use her body with their

eyes. They will evaluate her market price. They will comment on her defects, or compare them to those of other passers-by. . . . They will make her feel ridiculous, or grotesquely sexual, or hideously ugly. Above all, they will make her feel like a *thing*.⁸⁷

Susan Griffin took this a step further in a pathbreaking article on rape in 1971: "I HAVE NEVER BEEN FREE OF THE FEAR OF RAPE," she wrote. "RAPE IS AN ACT OF AGGRESSION in which the victim is denied her self-determination. It is an act of violence, which . . . always carries with it the threat of death. And finally, rape is a form of mass terrorism. . . ."⁸⁸

The first rape crisis hot line was established in Washington, D.C. in 1972, and rape crisis centers quickly emerged across the country, founded by women's liberation groups and NOW chapters alike. By the mid-1970s, NOW chapters had formed more than 300 local and state rape task forces. Rape crisis centers provided counsel and advice to rape victims, assisted them in dealing with police and medical personnel, set up speaker's bureaus, offered self-defense courses and training for health care professionals and police, and created support groups for victims.⁸⁹

The movement to create shelters for battered women grew from a similar impulse. The first such shelter, Women's Advocates in St. Paul, Minnesota, grew from a consciousness-raising group in 1971. They soon wrote a handbook on divorce and set up a telephone service to provide legal information. In response they were flooded with requests for emergency housing. They collected pledges to support the rent on a small apartment and a telephone answering service in 1973, but the demand was so great that members began taking women into their own homes. By 1974, when Women's Advocates opened the first shelter, the collective already had 18 months experience working with battered women. Other shelters grew out of rape crisis hot lines and coalitions between battered women and feminist activists.⁹⁰

THUS, CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING groups were the seedbeds for what grew into diverse movements around women's health, abortion, and violence against women. Sexual politics took a different direction, however, when an overtly lesbian feminism was articulated in the late sixties

and early seventies. Anne Koedt's pathbreaking article, "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm"—passed from hand to hand throughout the country before publication in *Notes from the First Year*—was a rousing call to sexual autonomy for women. She challenged the subordination of women's desire to a model of sexuality codified in Freud's assertion that there were two kinds of female orgasms, the immature "clitoral" orgasm and the mature "vaginal" orgasm. Koedt cited recent research by sexologists Masters and Johnson proving that all female orgasms were centered in the clitoris, which has many times more nerve endings than the relatively insensitive vagina.⁹¹ For heterosexuals, this suggested that women learn more about their own bodies, perhaps by reading *Our Bodies, Ourselves* or discussing orgasm and techniques of masturbation in a CR group and using that information to claim an equal right to sexual pleasure in relations with men. On the other hand, Koedt's suggestion that the penis was irrelevant to female sexual response led some to advocate celibacy and others to argue the superiority of lesbian relations.

Lesbianism, however, was still a strong social taboo. The many lesbians active in the various branches of the emerging women's movement were generally silent about their own sexuality. The personal bent of feminist discourse made that silence increasingly painful and rankling, as did the emergence of gay liberation in late 1969. Sidney Abbott and Barbara Love described their experience this way:

For lesbians, Women's Liberation is not an intellectual or emotional luxury but a personal imperative. . . . In the beginning, the highest aspiration of most lesbians in the women's movement was just that—to be included. For the first two years of the second wave of feminism, this desire to be included was the perspective from which lesbians viewed the women's movement. In the midst of gathering for Women's Liberation, they continued to submit to oppression by hiding so that they could be included, or worse, defensively trying to prove the obvious—that they were also "real" women.

Then came Gay Liberation.⁹²

Soon, sharp debates and confrontations broke out across the country as lesbians announced their presence and demanded attention, validation, and action based on *their* experience.

In NOW chapters the debates were more structural: they had to do with who elected officers were and what issues could be the focus of task forces. The New York chapter underwent at least two "purges," which removed vociferous lesbian leaders such as Rita Mae Brown from offices and positions of authority.⁹³ Betty Friedan steadfastly opposed what she saw as a diversion into "sexual politics" that would alienate most American women. Her fears of the "lavender herring" were partially allayed, however, as she came to realize how many feminist veterans whose commitment had been the backbone of the movement in the early, lean years were, in fact, lesbians.⁹⁴ After 3 years of conflict, in the fall of 1971 the national NOW convention finally passed a resolution ending

BE IT RESOLVED THAT N.O.W. RECOGNIZES THE DOUBLE OPPRESSION OF LESBIANS;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO HER OWN PERSON INCLUDES THE RIGHT TO DEFINE AND EXPRESS HER OWN SEXUALITY AND TO CHOOSE HER OWN LIFE-STYLE AND

BE IT RESOLVED THAT N.O.W. ACKNOWLEDGES THE OPPRESSION OF LESBIANS AS A LEGITIMATE CONCERN OF FEMINISM.⁹⁵

At least within NOW, the issue ceased to be a source of extreme division from that point on.

Among younger women in a generation marked by sexual experimentation and challenges to traditional sexual mores, the issue of lesbianism erupted as yet another form of personal politics. At the Second Congress to Unite Women on May 1, 1970, a meeting of a wide spectrum of feminist groups initially called by NOW, a group wearing "Lavender Menace" T-shirts and calling themselves Radicalesbians disrupted the proceedings on opening night to challenge the movement's prejudices by reading a paper entitled "The Woman-Identified Woman."

What is a lesbian? A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion. . . . Lesbian is the word, the label, the condition that holds women in line. . . . Lesbian is a label invented by the man to throw at any woman who dares to be his equal. . . . Affixing the label lesbian not only to a woman who aspires to be a person but also to any situation of real love, real solidarity, real primacy among women is a primary form of divisiveness among women."⁹⁶

By the time Radicalesbians staged this protest, the gay liberation movement was already more than a year old. Many lesbians found themselves caught between the male-dominated gay rights movement (in which people like Karla Jay and Rita Mae Brown, based on their own experience in Redstockings, fought for the creation of lesbian consciousness-raising groups) and the homophobia of the women's movement. For Jay, "the Lavendar Menace zap action . . . remains . . . the single most important action organized by lesbians who wanted the women's movement to acknowledge our presence and our needs."⁹⁷

Throughout the country the intense experiences of consciousness-raising groups evoked sexual tensions. The intimacy of such groups, the emotions they unleashed, felt to many like a kind of falling in love. A member of Bread and Roses described how

much of the energy that had heretofore gone into sexual relationships and especially couples was now being directed towards women friends and the women's community in general. This accounted for much of the strength and intensity of these new ties. Even women who remained in traditional heterosexual couples report 'getting high' from the energy level.⁹⁸

Since most participants were, and remained, heterosexual, when some of this energy was expressed in directly sexual terms many responded with fear and anxiety. A letter read aloud at a 1970 Bread and Roses Retreat, and later widely published, challenged "my sisters" not to " . . . see me with strange eyes." "Why when I love my sisters wholly

do I make you uneasy? Why, if I talk of my feelings, do you look away? . . . The irony of it all is that I probably would never have discovered my homosexuality without women's liberation."⁹⁹ Susan Griffin realized in retrospect that she had been a lesbian before she was married and that she had slipped into a kind of "numbness, a loss of an old self. . . . All it took was a weekend away from home at a women's conference and the experience of a few moments of what it is like to be supported by and to support other women, and I began to come alive again."¹⁰⁰

The hostile labeling of all feminists as lesbians was a common experience. It reached the national media in December 1970, when *Time* exposed Kate Millett's bisexuality with the comment that "her disclosure is bound to discredit her as a spokeswoman for her cause, cast further doubt on her theories and reinforce the views of those skeptics who routinely dismiss all liberationists as lesbians."¹⁰¹ By that time, whatever divisions existed over the political meanings of lesbianism, both gay and straight feminists understood that such a charge could not be allowed to stand. A group of highly visible feminist leaders in New York (including journalists Gloria Steinem and Susan Brownmiller, African-American lawyer Flo Kennedy, and founder of the Feminists Ti-Grace Atkinson) called a press conference to assert the common ground between women's liberation and gay liberation. They read statements of support from Aileen Hernandez and Wilma Scott Heide, national leaders of NOW, and from Congresswoman Bella Abzug and appear to have diffused the issue at least in the national press.¹⁰² The issues that had been raised, however, continued to be a focal point for divisions within the women's movement, and as in the case of abortion, they evolved from a forbidden and private matter into one of the most prominent and divisive topics in mainstream politics.

THE POLITICS OF THE FAMILY

Most consciousness-raising groups probably talked as much or more about the politics of the family as they did about the rape, abortion, or health issues. From the first report of the Presidential Commission on

the Status of Women in 1973, issues of family policy would take a prominent place (at least rhetorically) on the agenda of policy-oriented activists. Consciousness-raising groups, however, came to the question of family first as a result of their quest for the origins of women's oppression and their reexamination of the workings of power in intimate relations. Both groups relied heavily on "sex role socialization" theory to explain how women internalized traditional passive definitions of femininity.¹⁰³

Pat Mainardi's early paper, "The Politics of Housework," was a particularly effective consciousness-raising tool. Reading it produced that familiar "click" of recognition. In it she explained the texts and subtexts of household arguments trotted out by men:

"I've got nothing against sharing the housework, but you can't make me do it on your schedule." MEANING: Passive resistance. I'll do it when I damned well please, if at all. . . .

"I hate it more than you. You don't mind it so much." MEANING: Housework is garbage work. It's the worst crap I've ever done. It's degrading and humiliating for someone of my intelligence to do it. But for someone of your intelligence. . . .

"Women's liberation isn't really a political movement." MEANING: The Revolution is coming too close to home.¹⁰⁴

When Anita Shreve interviewed women about their experiences in consciousness-raising groups, she found that women, incensed at the inequities of household labor, would storm home from their women's liberation meetings to demand "that their husbands or lovers participate in shit-work [housework]." They would return with tales "of subterfuge in the most willing of husbands."¹⁰⁵ Across the country, similar interactions recurred thousands and thousands of times.

Meanwhile feminists also hotly debated the links between women's oppression and the nuclear family. In this instance, the drive for theoretical explanation ultimately reflected the very specific experiences of young, white, mostly unmarried women and built real barriers to the very women they hoped to reach. Although younger feminist radicals

were divided on the issue of marriage, most indicted it and the nuclear family as key sources of women's oppression, claiming that women were "kept in their place" and prevented from developing autonomous identities through their roles as wives, mothers, and daughters. Historian and Bread and Roses member Anne Popkin argued that this analysis led to "a vehement (though in retrospect not well thought out) rhetorical crusade against the nuclear family."¹⁰⁶ Young women in consciousness-raising groups across the country critiqued their own upbringing and their mothers' restricted roles. The vast majority of them were well-educated and white.¹⁰⁷ Their conversations were, as Popkin notes, "highly charged" by the fact that they themselves were at or approaching "the age when they were 'expected' to start families of their own, yet the prospect made them anxious."¹⁰⁸ Single mother Alice Kessler-Harris recalled that her group was notably unsympathetic to her dilemmas as a working mother. In fact, they refused to meet at her home on the grounds that she needed to be "separated" from her daughter.¹⁰⁹ Some groups went so far as to restrict the numbers of married women who could belong in the belief that their perspective would be biased by their commitment. The most famous and influential example of this was the Feminists, founded by Ti-Grace Atkinson in a break from the New York City chapter of NOW, which announced that no more than one-third of its voting members could be "in either a formal (with legal contract) or informal (e.g., living with a man) instance of the institution of marriage" on the grounds that "the identification of each woman's interests with those of a man prevents her from uniting with other women and seeing herself as a member of the class of women."¹¹⁰

Younger feminists' critique of the family and of motherhood as an identity—and the demographic reality that their generation was delaying childbirth and curtailing fertility to an astounding degree—meshed with the weariness of older feminists whose child care needs were behind them.¹¹¹ Florence Falk-Dickler, then head of the National NOW Task Force on Child Care, complained that women in her own NOW chapter were more interested in employment issues than in child care. Betty Friedan recalled that although there was a national task force on day care she was unable to develop a strong constituency on this issue in

any way comparable to the energy that emerged on such issues as abortion or employment discrimination. "... [T]he women who started NOW had had their fill of child care, or they were young professional women who had no children."¹²

The few who did pursue the issue at a policy level, however, discovered that child care was an issue that touched a deep public anxiety about the changing roles of women. Activists in the Chicago Women's Liberation Union's Action Committee for Decent Child Care were shocked by the depth of resistance and hostility they met in the community when they tried to organize around the issue. Project organizer Day Piercy recalled that she had "never been in a situation where people started with an issue and then went for the entire person. It made the women I was working with really feel as though they were bad mothers and there was something seriously wrong with them."¹³ When Congress passed a landmark day care funding bill in 1971, it was vetoed by President Nixon on the grounds that it "would commit the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing [instead of] the family-centered approach."¹⁴

Instead of legislative solutions, concerns about "sex role socialization" led to the creation of dozens of "liberated" day care centers and a variety of other projects designed to intervene in the socialization of girls and young women. For example, Group 22 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, read the existing sociological literature on sex roles and decided to create a child care center and to write and publish children's books—hence the birth of the Children's School for People Under Six and Lollipop Power. The book publishing group forming Lollipop Power learned through the feminist grapevine that there were others with similar ideas. At a meeting in 1970, the founders of Lollipop Power and the founders of the Feminist Press decided to avoid duplication of labor in the publication of books for children. Lollipop Power would produce preschool picture books and the Feminist Press would publish books for young readers.¹⁵

A different approach, pioneered by a group in Minnesota, illustrated the blending of NOW liberalism with women's liberation-radicalism. Cheri Register of Twin Cities Female Liberation and Gerri Helterline

of NOW met in a crush of demonstrators outside the men-only Oak Grill on the twelfth floor of Dayton's Department Store in Minneapolis on August 26, 1970. Frustrated that they would probably never be able to get inside, Register and Helterline, with several others, decided to head over to Powers Department Store (which had a similar males-only dining room) and "desexegrate" that one. Register had thought of NOW women as somewhat suspect, not really radical, but she was surprised to discover in the course of the day that "Gerri was just like me." Both of them had from time to time spoken to high school classes—Helterline as a member of the NOW speaker's bureau, Register as a representative of Female Liberation—and both were feeling frustrated. Piecemeal efforts were not enough. "We were not sure how to make contacts, but we wanted an onslaught in the schools."¹⁶

So, they each brought a couple of like-minded friends from their respective associations and constituted themselves as the Emma Willard Task Force, named for an early nineteenth century pioneer in women's education. As word of their availability spread, invitations to speak in classrooms snowballed, and that, too, began to be frustrating. It was time consuming, repetitive, unpaid work; they worried that they were just "the freak of the week" or the "Friday Special." In talking to teachers they also began to learn more about the obstacles teachers faced even when they wanted to change the curriculum. "We needed to move up in the hierarchy. Not knowing what to do—we just went right to the top, to the Commissioner of Education." They sent a letter to the Commissioner in April 1971 demanding a meeting.¹⁷

Over the next few months Emma Willard Task Force members met frequently with an official in the Department of Education, Don Hatfield, and became regular participants in a network of human relations training programs mandated by the state. "Our name was on the wire as people who could be called in to talk about sexism. It was a kind of 'advanced freak of the week': the black person, the Indian, the Chicano, and then us." They also put together a packet of curriculum materials, later a book that sold many thousands of copies through the workshops they conducted over several years. Emma Willard burned out after a few years, however. They did this work for little or no money, setting

aside their own career goals (Register's dissertation, for example, was delayed by more than a year) and realizing only late in the day that there was a whole industry of consultants on race and human relations who were well paid for similar work.¹¹⁸ Nonetheless, Emma Willard left a mark on the schools of Minnesota, which today require that all districts offer "multicultural, gender-fair" curricula. The work of the Emma Willard Task Force paralleled the efforts of other feminist investigations into educational practices, books, and textbooks.¹¹⁹

Near the end of the Emma Willard Task Force Packet from 1972 was a two-page mimeographed paper entitled "High School Women: The Suburban Scene." One of the readings for a ninth grade "Women's Liberation Mini Course" offered in Bloomington, Minnesota, offers evidence of the rapid spread of ideas and action as well as a glimpse of how personal politics spread beyond the boundaries of the organized movement.

The paper was by eighth grader Connie Dvorkin, who described herself as "a pacifist and a vegetarian since October 1968." She had learned of the women's liberation movement on radio station WBAI while at home in a conservative New York suburb. She wrote off for information and immersed herself in the literature that arrived.

Ironically the very night I was reading it I was baby-sitting and watching TV. The show, "I Love Lucy," was an episode where the two women were to be equal to the men for one night . . . and they couldn't do it. They had to depend on their husbands. . . . The kids I was sitting for laughed their asses off, and I realized that I would have, too, five months earlier.

Now, with awakened eyes, I could see all the brainwashing of my sisters that goes on at school.

Hearing that a court had struck down dress codes that required skirts for girls, she began to wear pants and found that she felt "more equal with boys." Then, with her mother's support, she waged a successful fight to take shop instead of home economics.¹²⁰

Hundreds of schools faced similarly rebellious young women, fre-

quently backed by supportive parents and the organized force of local feminists. Radio shows similar to WBAI's had sprung up across the country. Whereas talk shows welcomed the controversy surrounding women's liberation but were not necessarily sympathetic forums, alternative radio stations, many based on campuses, provided opportunities for feminists to create their own radio shows.¹²¹ Girls like Connie Dvorkin were listening, and the networks (and mimeograph machines) were in place to spread responses like hers quickly.

CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING presaged a broader societal trend toward the personal in the 1970s. Its success rested at least in part on its congruence with an emerging national mood. The "human potential movement" encompassing transcendental meditation, "T-groups," and encounter groups brought therapeutic activities into many public settings in the late sixties. Educational institutions at all levels, as well as business and civic organizations throughout the country, used "encounter groups" to build morale and increase productivity. The emphasis on emotional openness and honesty—even among total strangers—could be unsettling. A *Time* reporter who attended a seminar at Esalen Institute said, "Every aspect of so-called proper behavior is discarded. Every emotion is out in the open—everybody's property." Nudity was not uncommon—for example at the hot sulfur springs at Esalen—as participants sought to remove public personae and "strip down" to some personal essence.¹²²

In contrast to the inward turn of the human potential movement, however, the energy released in this early phase of the Second Wave drew on a fusion of private life and political action that allowed women to make *public* claims based on personal experience, to challenge the "naturalness" of women's secondary status in public settings, and to point out that power operates even at the most intimate levels, that the personal is political. This assault on the status quo was coupled with a utopian optimism about future possibilities. Nothing would be taken for granted. Perfection was possible. The critical guide to the diagnosis of problems and to proposing changes was personal experience. This was both the brilliance and the deepest flaw of women's liberation.

For several years, however, personal politics unleashed a phenomenally diverse burst of creativity. It created a political agenda and a political constituency, and it fostered myriad institutional innovations as women sought to create new avenues for action on issues previously considered private. Ultimately, it reshaped the political terrain of the United States as a whole.

Chapter 2

1. *Bread and Roses Newsletter* (November 1970): 5.
2. See Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988) and Wini Breines, *Young, White, and Miserable* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992); Sara M. Evans, *Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America* (New York: Free Press, 1989), chapter 11.
3. Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1963).
4. See Susan Chira, "Standing out in the Crowd," *New York Times* (August 10 1993): A1, 16. Madeline Kunin's autobiography offers a wonderful account of her life. See *Living a Political Life: One of America's First Women Governors Tells Her Story* (New York: Knopf, 1994).
5. Sara Ruddick, "A Work of One's Own," in Sara Ruddick and Pamela Daniels, eds., *Working It Out: 23 Women Writers, Artists, Scientists, and Scholars Talk About Their Lives and Work* (New York: Pantheon, 1977), p. 129.
6. Marilyn Young, "Contradictions," in Ruddick and Daniels, eds., *Working It Out*, p. 215.
7. Ruddick, "A Work of One's Own," p. 145.
8. Jane O'Reilly, "The Housewife's Moment of Truth," *Ms.*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1972): 54-55, 57-59.
9. See Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (New York: Knopf, 1979); Edith Hole and Ellen Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1971), and Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process* (New York: Longman, 1975); Flora Davis, *Moving the Mountain* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991).
10. On the concept of "free space" and the origins of feminism, see Evans, *Personal Politics*, and Sara M. Evans and Harry C. Boyte, *Free Spaces: Sources of Democratic Change in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986).
11. Seven state commissions were established in 1962 and 1963 while the Kennedy Commission prepared its report. "By February 1976, commissions had been set up in all fifty states and the District of Columbia." Catherine East, "Newer Commissions," in Irene Tinker, ed., *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1983), pp. 35-36.
12. See Evans, *Personal Politics*, pp. 50-53, quotes on pp. 51-52.
13. One of the best accounts of the traumatic events of 1968 is William Chafe, 1968: *The Unfinished Journey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), chapter 12. For other sources on the sixties see Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1993); Terry Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Alexander Bloom, ed., *Takin' It to the Streets: A 60s Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

14. See, for example, Marge Piercy, "Grand Coolie Damn" and Robin Morgan, "Introduction: The Women's Revolution," in Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood Is Powerful* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. xiii-xl, 421-437.
15. Jo Freeman was one of the first to point out the similarities between the two "branches" of the second wave and to differentiate them primarily in terms of age and structure. Others have agreed with her. See Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*; Jo Freeman, "Resource Mobilization and Strategy: A Model for Analyzing Social Movement Organization Actions," in Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, eds., *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics* (Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, 1979), pp. 57-189. See also Maren Lockwood Carden, *Feminism in the Mid-1970s: The Non-establishment, the Establishment and the Future: A Report to the Ford Foundation* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1977); Barbara Ryan, *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement, Ideology and Activism* (New York: Routledge, 1992); and Flora Davis, *Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991).
16. Quoted in Hole and Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism*, p. 84.
17. Hole and Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism*, pp. 81-87; Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 56-61; and Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, pp. 73-79.
18. Hole and Levine, *Rebirth*, pp. 95-98; Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 67-68; Marguerite Rawalt, "The Equal Rights Amendment," in Irene Tinker, ed., *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983), pp. 60-62.
19. Florynce Kennedy, *Color Me Flo: My Hard Life and Good Times* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976), pp. 39, 54. See also Gloria Steinem, "The Verbal Karate of Florynce R. Kennedy," *Ms.*, vol. 1, no. 9 (March 1973): 54-55, 89.
20. Amy Swerdlow, "Ladies Day at the Capitol: Women Strike for Peace Versus HUAC," *Feminist Studies*, vol. 8 (Fall 1982): 493-520; Amy Swerdlow, *Women Strike for Peace: Traditional Motherhood and Radical Politics in the 1960s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 10, 135-141. SWP had begun with a "strike" on November 1, 1961, when an estimated 50,000 women left jobs and kitchens to lobby to "End the Arms Race—Not the Human Race" while a radioactive cloud from a Russian nuclear test floated across the U.S. In 1962 the organization was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee where they employed the symbols and language of middle-class domesticity to make hash of the committee's efforts to intimidate them.
21. The description of this meeting in Chicago is based on my own memory of that event, at which I was present.
22. Kathie Amatniek, "Funeral Oration for the Burial of Traditional Womanhood," in *Notes from the First Year: Women's Liberation* (New York: New York

- Radical Women, 1968), Documents from the Women's Liberation Movement, an On-Line Archival Collection, Special Collections Library, Duke University.
23. The breakaway meeting was chaotic because it was huge, beyond anyone's imagining, and the radicals proclaiming "Sisterhood Is Powerful" had no program or plan of action. About 50 women from New York, Chicago, and Washington continued to meet over 2 days, laying plans for future women's liberation gatherings, but there, too, the tensions over what New Yorkers began to call "feminists" and "politicos" remained strong. For accounts of the Jeanette Rankin Brigade, see Echols, *Daring to Be Bad*, pp. 54-59; Rosen, *The World Split Open*, pp. 201-203; Brownmiller, *In Our Time*, pp. 21-23; Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 78-79.
24. Ellen Willis, "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism," in Sonya Sayres, Anders Stephanson, Stanley Aronowitz, and Fredric Jameson, eds., *The '60's Without Apology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 94. See also Marge Piercy, "Grand Coolie Damn," in Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood Is Powerful* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 473-492; and Robin Morgan, "Goodbye to All That," in Leslie Tanner, *Voices of Women's Liberation* (New York: New American Library, 1970), pp. 268-277.
25. The process of speaking bitterness was described in William Hinton, *Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), pp. 157-158.
26. "Redstockings Manifesto," *Notes from the Second Year* (1970), p. 113.
27. Judith Herman, "Dear Kathie," December 3, 1972, letter quoted in Ann Hunter Popkin, "Bread and Roses: An Early Moment in the Development of Socialist-Feminism" (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Sociology, Brandeis University, 1978), p. 59.
28. Linda Gordon, quoted in Popkin, "Bread and Roses," p. 98.
29. Quoted in Flora Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, p. 143.
30. Shirley Geok-Lin Lim, "Ain't I a Feminist: Re-forming the Circle," in Rachel Blau DuPlessis and Ann Snitow, eds., *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998), p. 453.
31. Elaine Brown, *A Taste of Power: A Black Woman's Story* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992); and Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, eds., *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy* (New York: Routledge, 2001).
32. Transcript of Sandy Springs Meeting, p. 37. Also Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), pp. 105-107.
33. Patricia Haden, Donna Middleton, and Patricia Robinson, Rosalyn Baxandall and Linda Gordon, eds., *Dear Sisters: Dispatches from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), pp. 93-95, quote on p. 95.
34. Inez Smith Reid, *"Together" Black Women* (New York: Third Press, 1975), pp.

- 35-54, quote on p. 40. See also Bell Hooks, *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism* (Boston: South End Press, 1981), p. 189.
35. Anna Nieto-Gomez, "La Femenista," *Encuentro femenino*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1974): 36.
 36. Mirta Vidal, "New Voice of LaRaza: Chicanas Speak Out," *International Socialist Review*, vol. 32, no. 9 (1971): 8; see also Francisca Flores, "Comision Femenil Mexicana," *Regeneracion*, vol. II, no. 1 (1971): 6-8; "Chicana Regional Conference," *La Raza*, vol. 1, no. 6 (1971): 43-44.
 37. Flores, "Comision Femenil Mexicana," *Regeneracion*, vol. II, no. 1 (1971): 6-8, quote on 6.
 38. Mirta Vidal, "New Voice of LaRaza: Chicanas Speak Out," *International Socialist Review*, vol. 32, no. 9 (1971): 7-9, 31-33.
 39. Jennie V. Chavez, "Women of the Mexican-American Movement: An Opinion," *Mademoiselle* (April 1972): 82, 150.
 40. Anna Nieto-Gomez, "La Femenista," *Encuentro Femenil*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1974): 34-47, quotes on 38.
 41. "Introduction: This Isn't One of Those Blondes You Can Pick up in the Supermarket," *Asian Women*, Berkeley, 1971, p. 4. Christina Adachi, "Nisei Women Speak!" *Women: A Journal of Liberation*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1974): 30-31.
 42. Esther Ngan-Ling Chow, "The Development of Feminist Consciousness Among Asian American Women," *Gender & Society*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September 1987): 284-299; Merilynne Hamano Quon, "Individually We Contributed, Together We Made a Difference," in Steve Louie and Glenn K. Omatsu, eds., *Asian Americans: The Movement and the Moment* (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center Press, 2001) pp. 207-219; Asian Women United of California, eds., *Making Waves: An Anthology of Writings by and About Asian American Women* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).
 43. "Indian Women's Groups Span a Broad Spectrum," *Indian Truth* (publication of the Indian Rights Association), no. 239 (May-June 1981): 8.
 44. Shirley Geok-Lin Lim, "Ain't I A Feminist: Re-forming the Circle," in Duplessis and Snitow, eds., *The Feminist Memoir Project*, p. 453.
 45. Barbara Grizzuti Harrison, "Unlearning the Lie: How One Group of Parents Dealt with Sexism and Racism in Their School and Among Themselves," *Ms.*, vol. 2, no. 5 (November 1973): 81-83, 110. Quotes on pp. 81 and 82. See also Bell Hooks, *Ain't I a Woman*, chapter 5.
 46. Harrison, "Unlearning the Lie," 83, 110, 82. Similar attitudes were expressed by a number of authors. For example, Linda La Rue wrote, "It is not that women ought not to be liberated from the shackles of their present unfulfillment, but the depth, the extent, the intensity, the importance—indeed, the suffering and depravity of the *real* oppression blacks have experienced—can only be minimized in an alliance with women who heretofore have suffered little more than boredom, genteel repression and dishpan hands." "Blacks are oppressed. . . . White women, on the other hand, are only suppressed. . . ." See "The

- Black Movement and Women's Liberation," in Robert Chrisman and Nathan Hare, eds., *Contemporary Black Thought: The Best from the Black Scholar*. (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973), pp. 116-125, quotes on pp. 117, 119.
47. Harrison, "Unlearning the Lie," p. 110.
 48. Frances M. Beale, "Sisterhood Is Still Powerful: Speaking up When Others Can't," *CrossRoads*, no. 29 (March 1993): 4-5, quotes on 4.
 49. Ida Sloan Snyder, "Convention 1970: A Gentle Revolution," *YWCA Magazine*, 64 (June 1970): 5-7, quote on 5; ISS, "One Imperative for All," *YWCA Magazine*, 64 (June 1970), 8-11; quote on 8; Renetia Martin, in Sara M. Evans, ed., *Faithful Journeys: Women, the Student Christian Movement, and Social Justice Activism 1955-1975* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming 2004).
 50. Renetia Martin in Evans, ed., *Faithful Journeys*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming 2004).
 51. See, for example, "Second Printing! The Black Woman in the Black Struggle," *Black Scholar*, vol. 2, no. 3-4 (January-February 1970); Linda LaRue, "The Black Movement and Women's Liberation," *Black Scholar* vol. 1, no. 7 (May 1970): 36-42; "The Black Woman," *Black Scholar*, vol. 3, no. 4 (December 1971); and Panther Women, "Panther Sisters on Women's Liberation," *The Movement* (September 1969).
 52. See Ruth Bordin, *Women and Temperance: The Quest for Power and Liberty, 1873-1900* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990).
 53. Eleanor Smeal, February 1978, quoted in *The Decade of Women: A Ms. History of the Seventies in Words and Pictures*, edited and produced by Suzanne Levine and Harriet Lyons (New York: Putnam, 1980), p. 188.
 54. Interview with Jan Schakowsky by Harry C. Boyte, Evanston, Illinois, April 30, 1977. Also quoted in *Personal Politics*, pp. 227-228.
 55. Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation* (New York: David McKay, 1975), p. 148; F. Cancian and B. Ross, "Mass Media and the Women's Movement: 1900-1977," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17 (1981): 9-26; Myra Marx Ferree and Beth B. Hess, *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985), pp. 74-77.
 56. "Take her off the stage . . ." quote was leveled at Marilyn Webb, who spoke at an antiwar rally in January 1969 in Washington, D.C. While she retained some loyalty to the left and the antiwar movements, others at the rally defined the reaction to her speech as a turning point in their relationship with the left. See Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad*, pp. 117-120; Rosen, *The World Split Open*, p. 134; Susan Douglas, *Where the Girls Are: Growing up Female with the Mass Media* (New York: Random House, 1994), p. 164.
 57. "The New Feminists: Revolt Against Sexism," *Time* (November 21, 1969): 56; "Woman-power," *Time* (March 30): 1970, 59.
 58. *New York Times* (August 12, 1970): 40. Both quoted in Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, p. 127.

59. *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* first listed "women's liberation" as a subtopic under "women" in volume 29, March 1969–February 1970, with three entries. The next year there were more than 75 entries under "women's liberation."
60. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), p. 27.
61. Personal communication from Ros Baxandall, Fall 2000; Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Viking, 2000), p. 160.
62. Susan Sutherland, "Radical Women Protest Ugly Pageant," *National Guardian*, September 14, 1968; "No Miss America!" leaflet in Jo Freeman's files; Beverly Grant to Pam Allen, personal letter, September 9, 1968, Pam Allen's files; Maren Lockwood Carden, *The New Feminist Movement* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1974), p. 32; and Echols, *Daring to Be Bad*, pp. 92–96.
63. Sheila D. Collins, "Women and the Church: Poor Psychology, Worse Theology," *Christian Century* (December 30, 1970): 1557–1559, quotes on 1557, 1559.
64. See Charlotte Bunch, *Passionate Politics: Feminist Theory in Action; Essays, 1968–1982* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), p. 7.
65. *Life*, vol. 69, no. 10 (September 4, 1970): 16B.
66. See coverage in *Time* (September 7, 1970): 12–13; *New Yorker*, vol. 46, no. 4 (September 5, 1970): 26–29; *Life*, vol. 69, no. 10 (September 4, 1970): 16B. See also Betty Friedan, *It Changed My Life* (New York: Random House, 1976), pp. 180–202.
67. Sandie North, "Reporting the Movement," *Atlantic* 235 (March 1970): 106; Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, p. 150.
68. Sophy Burnham, "Women's Lib: The Idea You Can't Ignore," *Redbook*, vol. 135 (September 1970): 188, 191.
69. "Bev Mitchell," in Louise Rosenfield Noun, ed., *More Strong-Minded Women: Iowa Feminists Tell Their Stories* (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1992), pp. 75, 76.
70. "Bev Mitchell," in Noun, ed., *More Strong-Minded Women*, pp. 77, 78, 82.
71. See Naomi Weisstein and Virginia Blaisdell, "Feminist Rock: No More Balls and Chains," *Ms.*, vol. 1, no. 6 (December 1972): 25–27, quote on 26.
72. Judy Chicago quoted in "Forum: What Is Female Imagery?" *Ms.*, vol. 3, no. 11 (May 1975): 34.
73. Announcement is reproduced in Lucy R. Lippard, "Transformation Art," *Ms.*, vol. 4, no. 4 (October 1975): 34.
74. See, for example, Lise Vogel, "Women, Art, and Feminism" in Deborah Rosenfeldt, ed., *Female Studies VII, Going strong: New Courses/New Programs* (Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press, 1973), pp. 42–53; Pat Mainardi, "A Feminine Sensibility?" *Feminist Art Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (April 1972): 4+; and Marjorie Kramer, "Some Thoughts on Feminist Art," *Women and Art*

- (Winter 1971): 3. By the early seventies there were several new journals in this area including *Feminist Art Journal*, *Women and Art*, and *Womanspace Journal*.
75. Nancy Anzara, "Artists in Their Own Image," *Ms.*, vol. 1, no. 7 (January 1973): 56; Lippard, "Transformation Art," 33–38.
76. Lippard, "Transformation Art," 33.
77. Wilson quoted in Lippard, "Transformation Art," 36.
78. For example, Day Piercy in the Chicago Women's Liberation Union worked closely with NOW in founding Women Employed, a pioneering organization of clerical workers (flyers announcing meetings and convention on October 20, 1974 sponsored by Women Employed, NOW, and other organizations, Women Employed: Rights & Roses, Gender Collection, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota); Sherrie Holmes, a socialist-feminist, founded a NOW chapter in Dayton and created a Task Force on Working Women to initiate Dayton Women Working, modeled on Women Employed. See Judith Sealander and Dorothy Smith, "The Rise and Fall of Feminist Organizations in the 1970s: Dayton as a Case Study," *Feminist Studies* vol. 12, no. 2 (Summer 1986): 325; and Judith Ezekiel, "Feminism in the Heartland: The Women's Movement in Dayton, Ohio in the 1970s," unpublished manuscript, 1999, pp. 182–183, 219–221 forthcoming Ohio State University Press, August 2002. New York Radical Feminists also experimented with organizing clerical workers in the late 1960s. Personal communication, Rosalyn Baxandall, Fall 2000.
79. Hole and Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism*, pp. 136–157; Echols, *Daring to Be Bad*, chapter 4, "Varieties of Feminism"; Susan Brownmiller, *In Our Time: Memoir of a Revolution* (New York: Dial Press, 1999), pp. 59–68; Jo Freeman, "The Tyranny of Structurelessness," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, vol. 17 (1972–1973): 151–164, reprinted in Baxandall and Gordon, eds., *Dear Sisters*, pp. 73–75.
80. See Ellen Willis, "Up from Radicalism: A Feminist Journal," *US* (October 1969): 5; also see Rosalind Pollack Petchesky, *Abortion and Woman's Choice: The State, Sexuality and Reproductive Freedom*, (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990), p. 129; Hole and Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism*, pp. 296–299; and Diane Schulder and Florynce Kennedy, *Abortion Rap* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), pp. 3–4.
81. Gloria Steinem, "Introduction," edited and produced by Suzanne Levine and Harriet Lyons with Joanne Edgar, Ellen Sweet, and Mary Thom, *The Decade of Women: A Ms. History of the Seventies in Words and Pictures* (New York: Putnam, 1980), p. 9.
82. "Shock troops" is Rosalind Petchesky's term. See Petchesky, *Abortion and Woman's Choice*, p. 127.
83. Laura Kaplan, *The Story of Jane: The Legendary Underground Feminist Abortion Service* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1995), pp. 9, 12, 44–46, 102, 280; Petch-

- esky, *Abortion and Woman's Choice*, p. 128. These sources are somewhat confusing about the meaning of the number of abortions performed. It may be that the number 11,000 includes all abortions carried out at their underground clinic both before and after they began, in the fall of 1970, to perform the operations themselves.
84. Sarah Weddington, *A Question of Choice* (New York: Putnam, 1992), chapters 3-7. See also David Garrow, *Liberty and Sexuality: The Right to Privacy and the Making of Roe v. Wade* (New York: Lisa Drew, 1994), chapters 7 and 8.
 85. Popkin, "Bread and Roses," p. 175; author's interview with Nancy Hawley, Cambridge, Massachusetts, August 7, 1973. See also Wendy Coppedge Sanford, "Working Together, Growing Together: a Brief History of the Boston Women's Health Book Collective," *Heresies*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1979): 83-92.
 86. Anita Shreve, *Women Together, Women Alone: The Legacy of the Consciousness-Raising Movement* (New York: Viking, 1989), pp. 83-86. Anne Koedt, "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm," *Notes from the First Year* (1968), reprinted in Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone, eds., *Radical Feminism* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1973), pp. 198-207.
 87. Meredith Tax, "Woman and Her Mind: The Story of Everyday Life," *Notes from the Second Year* (1970): pp. 10-16.
 88. Susan Griffin, "Rape—The All-American Crime," *Ramparts*, vol. 10, no. 3 (September 1971): 26, 35. This analysis was spelled out more fully in Brownmiller, *Against Our Will*.
 89. Susan Schecter, *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement* (Boston: South End Press, 1982), pp. 35-38.
 90. Schecter, *ibid.*, pp. 33, 58-65; Women's Advocates, *Women's Advocates: The Story of a Shelter* (St. Paul, MN: The Advocates, 1980). Author's interview with Sharon Rice Vaughan, St. Paul, Minnesota, May 1, 1998. See also Susan Brownmiller, *In Our Time*, pp. 263-264.
 91. Anne Koedt, "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm."
 92. Sidney Abbott and Barbara Love, *Sappho Was a Right-on Woman: A Liberated View of Lesbianism* (New York: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 135.
 93. Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 262-264. For Brown's version see Rita Mae Brown, "Take a Lesbian to Lunch," in Karla Jay and Allen Young, eds., *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation* (New York: New York University Press, 1972, 1992), pp. 185-195.
 94. Susan Brownmiller quotes Friedan as cautioning against the "lavender menace" whereas Brownmiller herself saw it only as a "lavender herring." Friedan recalls fearing a lesbian takeover and only gradually coming to realize that "some of the best, most hard-working women in NOW were in fact lesbian." Betty Friedan, *It Changed My Life: Writings on the Women's Movement* (New York: Random House, 1976), p. 141. Certainly the movement grapevine associated the term "lavender menace" with Friedan, and the Lavender Menace zap action was intended to refer to her.

95. Quoted in Abbott and Love, *Sappho Was*, p. 134.
96. Radicalesbians, "The Woman-Identified Woman," in Anne Koedt, Anita Rapone, and Ellen Levine, eds., *Notes from the Third Year: Women's Liberation* (New York: New York Radical Feminists, 1971), pp. 81-87; see also Echols, *Daring to Be Bad*, pp. 210-241; and Kate Millett, *Flying* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1974), pp. 14-19.
97. Karla Jay, *Tales of the Lavender Menace: A Memoir of Liberation* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), chapter 9, quote on p. 137. See also Brownmiller, *In Our Time*, pp. 96-100; Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 264-266.
98. Popkin, "Bread and Roses," p. 180.
99. "A Letter From Mary," in Jay and Young, eds., *Out of the Closets*, p. 182. For a discussion of the sexual tensions and the gay-straight split within Bread and Roses, see Popkin, "Bread and Roses," pp. 180-184.
100. Susan Griffin, "Reverberations," in Karol Hope and Nancy Young, eds., *Out of the Frying Pan . . . A Decade of Change in Women's Lives* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1979), p. 247.
101. *Time* (December 14, 1970): 50.
102. Sidney Abbott and Barbara Love, *Sappho Was a Right-on Woman: A Liberated View of Lesbianism* (New York: Stein and Day, 1972), pp. 123-125; Brownmiller, *In Our Time*, pp. 148-151.
103. Alice S. Rossi, "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," *Daedalus*, vol. 93, no. 2 (Spring 1964): 607-652; Popkin, "Bread and Roses," 77; Kate Millett, "Sexual Politics: A Manifesto for Revolution," in Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt, eds., *Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation; Major Writings of the Radical Feminists* (New York: Radical Feminism, 1970), pp. 111-112. Radical feminists, indeed, defined their goal as the abolition of sex roles. See Anne Koedt, "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm," in Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone, eds., *Radical Feminism* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1973), pp. 198-207.
104. Pat Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," in *Notes from the Second Year* (1970), pp. 28-31, quotes on p. 29; Jane O'Reilly, "The Housewife's Moment of Truth," *Ms.*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1972): 54-55, 57-59.
105. Anita Shreve, *Women Together, Women Alone: The Legacy of the Consciousness-Raising Movement* (New York: Viking, 1989), p. 139.
106. Popkin, "Bread and Roses," p. 77.
107. Popkin, "Bread and Roses," pp. 23-30; Shreve, *Women Together*, pp. 40-43, 51-52.
108. Popkin, "Bread and Roses," p. 78.
109. Interview with Alice Kessler-Harris, New York City, December 13, 1997.
110. "The Feminists: A Political Organization to Annihilate Sex Roles," in Firestone and Koedt, eds., *Notes from the Second Year* (New York: Radical Feminism, 1970), p. 117.
111. The plummeting birthrate cannot be overstated. The number of births per

- 1000 women ages 15-44 had fallen by the mid-1970s to nearly half the rate in 1957 at the peak of the baby boom. See Cynthia Taeuber, *Statistical Handbook on Women in America* (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1991), p. 20.
112. Falk-Dickler quoted in Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, p. 281; Friedan, *It Changed My Life*, p. 175.
 113. Author's interview with Day Piercy, Chicago, July 16, 1981.
 114. Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, p. 283; Edward F. Zigler and Jody Goodman, "The Battle for Day Care in America: A View from the Trenches," in Edward F. Zigler and Edmund W. Gordon, eds., *Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues* (Boston, MA: Auburn House Publishing, 1982), pp. 343-345.
 115. I attended this meeting in Baltimore and remember meeting Alix Kates Shulman there. The first book published by the Feminist Press was a children's book designed for young readers, *The Dragon and the Doctor*, by Barbara Danish.
 116. Author's telephone interview with Cheri Register, August 21, 1993.
 117. *Ibid.*; letter to Howard Casmey, Commissioner of Education, April 16, 1971, Emma Willard Task Force on Education Packet (Minneapolis, MN: February 23, 1972; December 8, 1971).
 118. *Ibid.*; Emma Willard Task Force on Education Packet. The packet included a biography of Emma Willard, articles and position papers regarding women's liberation and girls and sports, consciousness-raising exercises for classroom use, and a 38 page bibliography.
 119. The following, for example, can be found in the Emma Willard Task Force Bibliography: Janice Law Trecker, "Women in U.S. History High School Textbooks," *Social Education* (March 1971), 249-260, 338; *Little Miss Muffet Fights back: A Bibliography of Recommended Non-sexist Books About Girls for Young Readers* (New York: Feminists on Children's Media, 1974); Marcia Federbush, *Let Them Aspire: A Plea and Proposal for Equality of Opportunity for Males and Females in the Ann Arbor Public Schools* (May 1971); Anne Grant West, *Report on Sex Bias in the Public Schools* (New York: New York City Chapter of NOW, n.d.); Women on Words and Images, *Dick and Jane as Victims: Sex Stereotyping in Children's Readers* (Princeton, NJ: Women on Words and Images, 1975).
 120. Connie Dvorkin, "High School Women: The Suburban Scene," Emma Willard Task Force on Education Packet.
 121. Cynthia Ellen Harrison, *Women's Movement Media: A Source Guide* (New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1975), based on 2000 questionnaires sent out in 1973 or 1974, lists several national and local radio sources. The Pacifica Program Service, for example, serving four stations (KPFA in Northern California, KPFA in southern California, KPFT in Houston, and WBAI in New York) and distributing programs to nonprofit or educational radio stations located principally on school, college, and university campuses, listed more than 60 taped programs of interest to feminists. Similarly, Radio Free People and Ra-

dio Free Women of Washington, D.C. listed numerous tapes and interviews available for rebroadcast. What Harrison's questionnaire did not capture, apparently, was the existence of locally produced feminist "women's shows" on nonprofit, usually campus-based, radio stations across the country.

122. See, for example, "Human Potential: The Revolution in Feeling," *Time* 96 (November 9, 1970): 54-58.

Chapter 3

1. "Never Underestimate . . ." *Newsweek*, July 26, 1971, 29.
2. "Never Underestimate . . ." *Newsweek*, July 26, 1971, 29-30, quotes on 29; Rona F. Feit, "Organizing for Political Power: The National Women's Political Caucus," in Bernice Cummings and Victoria Schuck, eds., *Women Organizing: An Anthology* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1979), p. 185; Sheila Tobias, *Faces of Feminism: An Activist's Reflections on the Women's Movement* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997), pp. 246-247; Winifred Wandersee, *On the Move: American Women in the 1970s* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1988), pp. 22-23.
3. Political scientists Joyce Gelb and Marian Lief-Palley, in *Women and Public Policies: Reassessing Gender Politics* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1996), pp. 5-6, argue similarly that the issues that provoked least controversy were issues of equity that did not—on the surface at least—threaten role changes. One of their primary examples of a reform that fit this requirement was the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. See also Zillah R. Eisenstein, *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism* (New York: Longman, 1981).
4. *Boston Globe* quoted in *NWPC Newsletter IV*, vol. II, no. IV (June 1973): 5.
5. Dennis A. Deslippe, "Rights, Not Roses": *Unions and the Rise of Working-Class Feminism, 1945-80* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), p. 120; Catherine East, "Remarks for Veterans of Feminist American Meeting," May 26, 1993 (typescript); Hole and Levine, *Rebirth of Feminism*, pp. 82-83, 85; Davis, *Moving the Mountain*, pp. 53-54, 57.
6. Susan M. Hartmann, "Allies of the Women's Movement: Origins and Strategies of Feminist Activists in Male Dominated Organizations in the 1970s: The Case of the International Union of Electrical Workers," Paper presented at the 1993 Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Poughkeepsie, New York, June 1993, and *The Other Feminists: Activists in the Liberal Establishment* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
7. In *Rosenfeld v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1968) a district court invalidated a California weight-lifting law for women. The court held that state protective laws didn't constitute a bfoq and that such laws were superseded by Title VII. This case is often cited as "the catalyst for the eventual demise of state protective laws." See Karen J. Maschke, *Litigation, Courts and Women Workers* (New