

Center for the American Woman and Politics

# Women State Legislators

Report from a  
Conference

May 18-21, 1972

*Sponsored by*  
Center for the American Woman and Politics  
Eagleton Institute of Politics — Rutgers-The State University

## **CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS**

**Eagleton Institute of Politics  
Rutgers-The State University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901  
Phone: 201-828-2210**

The Center for the American Woman and Politics is a unique, timely research and educational center committed to increasing knowledge about American women's participation in government and politics. As the newest unit within the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, the Center programs reflect Eagleton's tradition of creating high-quality research and educational programs which emphasize the practical realities of American politics.

The Center believes in encouraging the full and effective involvement of women in American public life. It supports the growth and strength of a truly representative government responsive to the needs of all citizens, female and male alike.

Center activities include: planning and testing model educational programs, generating and sponsoring research, convening conferences and symposia, publishing and disseminating information. By designing and sponsoring a variety of related programs, the Center serves a catalytic role in developing substantive information about women's participation in government and politics.

Established in 1971 with the aid of a Ford Foundation grant to the Eagleton Institute, the Center for the American Woman and Politics seeks additional funds to support its programs. Neither the Center for the American Woman and Politics nor the Eagleton Institute of Politics is a lobbying organization. All programs undertaken by the Center and the Institute are nonpartisan.

# Women State Legislators

## Report from a Conference For Women in Public Life

May 18-21, 1972

*Sponsored by*  
**Center for the American Woman and Politics  
Eagleton Institute of Politics — Rutgers-The State University**

## CONTENTS

<b>WHY A CONFERENCE FOR WOMEN STATE LEGISLATORS</b> .....	3
Purpose of the Conference .....	4
Selecting the Legislators .....	5
Organizing the Discussion Groups .....	6
 <b>IMPRESSIONS FROM THE CONFERENCE:</b>	
<b>REPORTS FROM THE DISCUSSION GROUPS</b> .....	7
Do Women Make Different Legislators from Men? .....	7
Committee Assignments and Leadership Positions .....	11
Family Responsibilities .....	13
The Women's Movement .....	16
Women as Candidates .....	20
 <b>QUESTIONS FOR THE DISCUSSION GROUPS</b> .....	24
 <b>PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE</b> .....	26
 <b>PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE</b> .....	28
Discussion Groups .....	28
Panelists in Plenary Sessions .....	30
Interviewers .....	30
Planning Committee Members .....	31
 <b>CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS:</b>	
<b>A Description</b> .....	Inside Front Cover
 <b>CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS:</b>	
<b>Advisory Committee</b> .....	Inside Back Cover

## WHY A CONFERENCE FOR WOMEN STATE LEGISLATORS?

Currently, there is in this country a good deal of interest in encouraging women to become active in public life. Yet there is only minimal recognition and certainly no deep understanding of the political and personal realities confronting women who seek elective office. It is commonly assumed that women face obstacles—in entering politics, in competing for higher office, in functioning successfully as politicians—which are more difficult than those facing aspiring or practicing male politicians. Is this indeed the case? There are many hypotheses which suggest reasons for the paucity of women beyond the local level in politics. Firm evidence is scarce.

As an educational and research center concerned with increasing the contribution women can make to the American political system, the Center for the American Woman and Politics decided to hold a series of conferences for women already in public life, who could address themselves to questions about women's political participation on the basis of personal experience. This report deals with the first such conference, which was made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The Conference for Women State Legislators brought together fifty outstanding women office holders from twenty-eight states. The decision to invite legislators, as opposed to women holding other elective positions, was based on several considerations. In the first instance, some women do hold office as state legislators—at least one woman in each of the fifty states. Out of a nationwide total of over 7,700 state legislators, approximately 344 were women.\*

Nevertheless, women who have competed successfully with men and learned to operate effectively in such highly political (and male) domains as state legislatures remain a rare species. The National Conference of State Legislative Leaders in its 1971 Yearbook counted only three women among its national compilation of legislative officers and leaders.

Furthermore, state legislators hold a position midway in the hierarchy of elective office in this country. Representatives and senators have been tested in the crucible of local politics and have won the right to represent constituencies (ranging from 1,000 to 300,000 persons) in the state capitol. Many have attained state-wide reputation. Their job requires them to be away from home for long periods, and falls just short of demanding that the family move to a different location. Women state legislators, more than any other group and more than most individuals, are in a position to analyze the

---

\*As a result of the November, 1972 election, 424 women will serve in the state legislatures in 1973. This represents a 19% increase over 1972.

satisfactions and sacrifices inherent in an active and successful political life for women.

Finally, women legislators were selected for the Center's first conference because of the continuing interest of the Eagleton Institute in strengthening state legislatures as a vital part of our federal system of government. Since 1966, Eagleton has sponsored a week-long seminar for state legislators in which 300 senators and representatives from all fifty states have participated. It was felt that the experiences, attitudes and perceptions of women legislators as a group might have an important bearing on the work of Eagleton's Center for Legislative Research and Service.

### **Purpose of the Conference**

The conference exceeded all expectations as a forum where legislators could talk informally with colleagues as elected officials, as politicians and as women. For many of the participants the conference afforded a unique opportunity to meet officials from other states. The participants were impressed by the level of competence and degree of commitment found among their colleagues:

The opportunity for me to meet and exchange ideas with the other participants was one of the most worthwhile experiences of my career.

I appreciated above all that we were taken seriously enough to have a conference focusing on our status.\*

Discussion groups were designed to encourage the legislators to focus constructively on the problems and prospects facing women in politics so that a) they could provide mutual strength and support for each other wherever possible, b) they would consider ways in which other women could be encouraged to participate actively and effectively in public life, and c) they could illuminate attitudes and actualities which impede their effectiveness as legislators and which might be ameliorated by being brought to public attention or pinpointed for purposes of further study.

Finally, the participants contributed to the research for one of the first substantive books on women in contemporary American politics. By completing questionnaires and agreeing to lengthy individual interviews with experienced researchers during the conference, they supplied much of the background and data for a study which will explore the terms, conditions and limits of women's participation in state legislatures. Sponsored by the Center for the American Woman and Politics, with the assistance of a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the book is being written by Dr. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick,

---

\*These and subsequent quotations were taken from the discussion group transcripts and the evaluation sheets submitted after the conference.

Associate Professor of Political Science at Georgetown University, for publication by Basic Books, Inc. in 1973.

### **Selecting the Legislators**

The success of the conference depended on the participation of exceptionally able women legislators who, in addition to their other qualities, had some degree of interest in discussing questions related specifically to women in politics.

It was important to limit the participants to a number which would be small enough to allow everyone to participate freely in the discussion, but large enough to accommodate a broad diversity of backgrounds and points of view. The optimum number was deemed to be fifty, and the Planning Committee considered inviting one legislator from each state. (See page 31 for Planning Committee members.) It was finally decided that the individual participants, as well as the conference as a whole, would stand to gain were two legislators invited from each of twenty-five states. The following criteria formed the basis for selection:

1. Geographic distribution within and among the states;
2. Representation from both parties, different types of political systems, varying age levels and degrees of seniority;
3. Intention to seek reelection to the legislature or other elective office;
4. Interest in the effectiveness of legislative institutions, particularly in regard to their responsiveness to women legislators;
5. Interest in exploring ways and means to encourage and enable more women to seek elective office;
6. Willingness to complete and return one questionnaire prior to the conference and to participate in a taped interview with an experienced researcher during the conference.

The state legislative officers of the American Association of University Women, The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the League of Women Voters in twenty-six states were requested to fill out forms recommending from two to four women legislators in their states whom they regarded as able political leaders and who met the above criteria. These nonpartisan organizations each has a broad membership base and years of experience in working with local government officials, and their cooperation in the selection process contributed substantially to the success of the conference.

Responses were quickly and enthusiastically forthcoming, and on the basis of the recommendations, a selection committee at the Center compiled a list of legislators and alternates who would receive invitations. The fifty women who finally attended ranged in age from 30 to 68 years and had served in office from two to eighteen years.

## Organizing the Discussion Groups

Four discussion groups, each composed of twelve to fourteen legislators, formed the heart of the conference. Membership in each discussion group remained the same during three sessions, which lasted over eight hours during two days. (For a list of discussion group leaders, rapporteurs and participants, see page 28.)

All four groups were given the identical assignment of working through a series of open-ended questions dealing with 1) the position of women within the various structures and institutions of the legislature, 2) the impact of women in the legislature, and 3) women running for political office. (See page 24, Questions for Discussion Groups.)

Each group was chaired by a distinguished woman whose responsibility was to promote discussion in as relaxed and stimulating a manner as possible and to elicit a maximum of points of view. The leaders functioned in a politically neutral capacity and avoided injecting themselves into the debate. The directive to the group leaders described their assignment:

To create an atmosphere in which the legislators feel free to talk openly so that they can learn from one another and others can learn from them. The conference will be successful if the legislators hear themselves and others making remarks, identifying attitudes, discovering responses, and uncovering information which may be surprising to everyone present. Our goal is not to encourage verbalization of conditioned reactions or stereotypical images. It is to create a situation in which informal interaction stimulates fresh perceptions.

Four experienced newspaperwomen, functioning as rapporteurs, had the difficult assignment of keeping a record of the discussion and preparing a summary after each session. It was intended that their reports would be combined in a brief general report for discussion by the entire conference in the final plenary session, but this plan proved impossible to implement by the conference deadline. This report, therefore, is intended to serve in part as a summary of discussions at the conference.

## IMPRESSIONS FROM THE CONFERENCE Based on Reports from the Discussion Groups

During the conference there was no attempt to take a vote, poll the participants or even reach a consensus on any of the issues under discussion. Nevertheless, it is possible to draw certain generalizations, based on the summaries prepared by the rapporteurs for each of the discussion groups.

"I have to be better," summarizes the way women state legislators view their own performance versus that of their male colleagues in most facets of political life. Women legislators agree that women must work harder to get into the legislature, and once there, must be better prepared than the men to maintain credibility with colleagues and constituents.

It is an objective fact that women legislators tend to be twenty years older than their male colleagues. The average male legislator is in his mid-thirties. The average female legislator is in her mid-fifties.

It is a subjective evaluation that for many women the office is seen as the culmination of a lifetime of service to the community and may be regarded as a reward or an end in itself, whereas for men the job is more frequently a stepping stone to higher office or a component of a successful career outside the legislature.

Are such conditions and assumptions immutable given social attitudes and women's roles within the family, or are there factors at work which may change the political equation so far as the sexes are concerned?

### Do Women Make Different Legislators from Men?

Despite the fact that the conference took place against the backdrop of the women's movement, the increasing representation of women at the presidential conventions, and the growing attention being given women candidates in the 1972 elections, it was obvious from the start of the discussions that the legislators were reluctant to concentrate specifically on their experiences as women. They are accustomed to thinking of themselves as legislators, as successful politicians, as competent in dealing with a variety of issues, as professionals or volunteers in their respective fields, or as wives, mothers and grandmothers. For most of the participants, being a woman was something to be ignored, or taken for granted, or suppressed, but certainly not a primary subject for analysis and discussion with colleagues in a semi-public forum. In view of this reluctance, it is interesting to note that these women had accepted invitations to a Conference for Women State Legislators, whose announced purpose was precisely to discuss their experiences as women in the expectation that their insights would benefit a wider audience.

The legislators unanimously proceeded from the assumption that there are no significant differences between male and female legislators and that women

legislators have no special problems or particular advantages by virtue of their sex. However, as soon as specific questions were discussed, it became apparent that as legislators women and men function differently in a number of respects. Some of these differences are attributable to sex, some to society's attitudes and others to the legislators' perceptions of themselves and the backgrounds they bring to the legislature. Some arise from the fact that women as a group constitute a small minority in any state legislature.

Perhaps because men hold low expectations for women legislators, perhaps because of their scarce numbers and concomitantly high visibility, perhaps because many women tend to be issue oriented rather than power oriented, and see themselves as representing broad interests and a wide constituency rather than special interests or a particular group—undoubtedly because of a combination of these and other factors, women legislators tend to take their responsibilities seriously and to be sensitive to personal shortcomings which may reflect on women as a class.

There is no doubt that all the women legislators were conscious of entering a male dominated body when they were first elected to the legislature, even though they were not in the habit of giving this fact explicit recognition. The conference provided the first occasion for many of the legislators to discuss the implications of sex differences and membership in a small minority so far as their work in the legislature is concerned.

If you come to the legislature, it is presumed that you will be good. If you come as a woman, it is presumed that you probably will not. If you can show, the first time, that that presumption is incorrect, then you're all right. On the other hand, if you prove them correct in their presumption, they despise you twice for being [a woman] as well as for being ineffective.

In comparison with their male colleagues, women tend to perceive themselves as more honest, less corruptible, less willing to compromise, more concerned with the public interest, nicer to the legislative staff, less interested in personal gain, more accessible to constituents, more oriented to issues and less to fulfilling their own egos, and more independent of party demands. Because women in general are expected to be more emotional, more talkative, less familiar with the facts, women legislators are determined to be none of these things.

For example, there was general agreement that women must be careful not to talk too often or too long on the floor or in committee, and to be careful to have their facts correct at all times. Most of the women believed that women legislators do not speak as readily as men on the floor, not out of reticence, but so that they will command attention when they have something to say. The frequent utterances of men were ascribed to the male ego, i.e. "they like to hear their own voices." The point was not that women politicians lack egos, but that they have been trained not to show them. Men are permitted to be verbose, but women have to be direct.

There was mention of the fact that women legislators tend to be less emotional than men, perhaps in part because they are consciously steeling themselves against stereotyped images of emotional women. On an issue such as abortion reform, for example, "the men came in with tears, emotional testimony, tearing of hair, until I was embarrassed." Others agreed that it is the men who become upset.

Women have to be on guard to protect their image in even the smallest areas. One woman got knowing laughs when she said, "You look around at times and you see men falling asleep [in sessions]. Sometimes it's extremely boring, but you know a woman cannot go to sleep in her seat."

The same rule seems to apply to drinking habits. All agreed that one drunken woman on the floor of the House would reflect on all women, and the others would try to prevent her from appearing. No one (in this group) had ever seen a woman enter the chamber in this condition, although they had often seen inebriated male colleagues. Men are aloof from other men in such situations, and their images are not affected by one man's lunch-time indulgence.

Another participant observed that a woman legislator should have exactly the same kind of image as a man: "Someone who disagrees agreeably, won't carry grudges, won't end up crying. In other words, a woman who won't confirm a stereotype. If a woman holds grudges, the men seem to feel it's because she's a woman, not because she has a right to."

Do women operate under the same ethical principles as men in the legislature? One replied, "I hope not, because I think money is passing hands and there is a lot of trading of votes [among males]." This type of response, which was strong among at least half the participants, gave rise to the next question: Are we saying women have higher ethical standards, or is it because they are in the minority? The consensus was that women legislators tend to be more concerned with the public interest and less influenced by special interests, but it was conceded that if women were to comprise closer to half of each legislature, the proportion of those who would be corrupt would probably equal the proportion of men.

Women in politics may appear more honest than men, partly because there is less opportunity for women to be involved in conflicts of interest because few have outside employment, partly because they have not yet been co-opted into the power structure, and may therefore be subjected to fewer temptations. No one stated categorically that women in general inherently subscribe to a higher code of ethics than men in general.

There is a discernible difference in relations with lobbyists. The women indicated they struck up no great friendships with lobbyists, male or female. "The men go out and play basketball; they go out for dinner. The men have a friendship because they're fellow jocks." This "buddy-buddy" relationship, as seen by the women, may work to the disadvantage of some men insofar as they become involved on a personal basis. "Men have an emotional loyalty to the guys they play basketball with; it's not just the money."

The men, it seems, are more susceptible to flattery. "Women can't be

approached like that. They've been approached like that since they were thirteen. A man comes to the legislature at 40 and he's wined and dined for the first time. Before, he's always had to pay. The lobbyist uses the same kind of flattery on men that men use on young women. We just don't buy that." It was noted that female legislators, for the most part, can afford to be more independent than males regarding lobbyists, and this independence they owe to their husbands who make their living.

All the women recognized a double standard in matters of sex. A woman legislator must be chaste, while men are free to have affairs. Male legislators delight in gossiping about any woman who appears to deviate, but the women themselves are often guilty of setting severe standards for other women while regarding the sexual activities of men with some tolerance. Women legislators impose tougher standards of performance on themselves and on other women of achievement than on men, but they agreed that "we should get to the point where it doesn't matter who goes to bed with whom." Here again, the paucity of women legislators makes them so conspicuous that the action of one woman is seen to reflect on the others.

If you serve on the county board, you go home at night. If you serve in the national Congress, you move your family to Washington. But the legislature is a lost never-never land. You commute. For the men, all the things that keep their values—their family, their children, their church—are back home. That's the pattern. When they're in the capital, they're picking up waitresses and hatcheck girls. The pressure of the split personality is more than people can put up with.

Numerous instances were cited of such behavior on behalf of men, for whom it is regarded as understandable and forgivable. But for women legislators, who presumably suffer similar dislocations, such behavior is neither forgivable nor forgettable.

Nearly all women legislators have to deal with functioning as one of very few females in a male environment. A number worked explicitly to establish a motherly or grandmotherly relationship with their male colleagues, while the younger single women believed they had to establish immediately that they were not interested in anything but business. One woman prefers to get to know the wives of her male colleagues and occasionally asks them permission before having business dinners with their husbands.

The double standard affects women functioning as legislators insofar as it relates to the socializing, which is an integral part of the informal infrastructure of the legislature. Everyone who spoke of the matter agreed that there were certain types of socializing in which she did not engage with her male colleagues, such as their heavy drinking sessions and poker parties. There was no dissent from the proposition that women legislators should not become involved in heavy drinking sessions, even when invited, as they sometimes are. These are frequently occasions when legislative deals are made, although it was pointed out that there are some important male members of the legislature

who do not engage in these sessions. When deals are made in these "social sessions" important members of the legislature who were not present may be consulted the following morning before the group goes ahead with its plans. Some women do have enough clout to qualify for such consultation, so the fact that women are not included in the evening social activities does not invariably affect their participation in the decision-making process.

One of the participants said that she and another woman legislator take an apartment together in the state capital where they give parties several times a year and invite their male colleagues. "It's a way to return their hospitality when they do invite us to dinner without trying to be 'one of the boys.'"

A staunch women's rights advocate said even she would not go up to a table of male legislators in a hotel and join them for breakfast or any meal unless invited, because they always want to pay for her meal. The women legislators have tricks to get men to forego paying. One puts the bill total in an envelope in the man's desk later. Another passes a man her share before the waiter comes. One sends liquor to the insistent men who won't let her pay. Another woman often says "lunch is on me" after a floor fight with another legislator. "Men won't ask you to eat with them if they think they'll have to pay," said one woman.

The women admitted that they rarely were invited to lunch or dinner when "things were really cooking." They are asked for votes after policy is set. Even women who chair important committees are left out unless pressure is put on the men.

Most of the legislators noted slight changes in the behavior of the men when women were present. There was general agreement that the men, without being specifically told to do so, did clean up their language when a woman legislator was present. No one challenged the desirability of this voluntary sterilization. One woman described the firm position she took early in her first term against having men stand when she entered a room.

There was widespread agreement that women generally are discriminated against when it comes to official trips taken by legislators. One legislator asserted that women ought to come out and ask for junkets if they want them, discarding the "passive role" for which they have been raised.

"They don't want to be encumbered with a woman," replied another participant. What she meant (it finally became clear after a long discussion) was that the men do not want women around for two reasons: 1) they fear the women might report back that the men did not work very hard, in some cases not attending any of the business sessions, and 2) they do not want women around because they are looking for "fun and games."

## **Committee Assignments and Leadership Positions**

Do women legislators consider themselves victims of sex discrimination when it comes to committee assignments and access to leadership positions in

the legislatures? Some of the participants said that they had bad committee assignments as freshmen—but that most freshmen men did too. Most feel that they have worked hard, proved themselves, and have all or at least some of the more desirable committee assignments by now.

Although many of the women said they felt no personal discrimination it was frequently brought out that women “can go just so far and no farther” in the legislative power structure. There is no disputing the fact that, while women chair a fair number of committees, few women chair important committees.

One senior legislator opened a conference session with the observation that women may have reasonably decent committee assignments, but that few are chairmen and fewer still are in leadership positions. “Maybe we’re where we are because we’re not pushing. There isn’t a single solitary door in this world that will open without pushing. I’m going back home and I’m going to push.” She clearly felt the conference had made her aware that her position was not as good as she had considered it, the reason being that as a woman, she had been reticent about asserting her position.

This raises the question whether women have to be more aggressive than men to participate effectively in the legislature. Because this experienced legislator has held back and perhaps has not been aggressive enough, she now wonders whether she missed out on opportunities she otherwise might have had such as special committee assignments, “those junkets we were talking about,” and one other important thing: “We are not privileged to know the mechanics that are going on in the inner circle, because we are not committee chairmen. I think many things are not discussed in my presence because they think women tattle.” She doesn’t “tattle” and she plans to make this point pretty forcefully to some people in her state.

The women recounted a variety of experiences, depending on the individual situation in their states. A legislator who felt that she personally was treated well “wondered how many ‘average’ women get to top leadership compared to ‘average’ men?” Someone replied that women can attain leadership positions, but they have to be “aggressive and strong.” In one state after “a struggle, the women finally succeeded in getting the men to agree to running a woman for whip.”

A serious example of discrimination was cited involving a woman who is president pro-tem of her state Senate, and who has never been invited to the weekly meetings of the legislative leadership. It turned out, under questioning, that she had never asked to be included. Said her fellow legislator who reported this situation: “A lot of us have been sensitized only recently about the corners we’ve been pushed into.”

A black legislator credited Shirley Chisholm for making it possible for women state legislators to get the committees they wanted, because she spoke out about the committees to which she had been assigned in Congress. “When I got elected the press asked me what committees I had requested and they stayed around to see if I got them. I did.”

In one group, all the women said they received the committee appointments

they wanted, although they did not dwell on their reasons for requesting certain committees. In the course of discussion it developed that one requested appointment to committees on agriculture, education and safety—rather than to finance and judiciary, her keenest interests—because as a junior legislator she did not feel she ought to ask for those two. By contrast, another woman immediately requested and received appointment to the Appropriations Committee because she saw it as the best way to find out quickly how the state operated. Another said she felt no discrimination after three terms in the House and two in the Senate. “My first term in the House I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee because I was the logical lawyer.”

Some disagreed. “I feel strongly women are discriminated against as legislators, and I don’t think the men are always even aware. Women do have to work terribly hard to accomplish equality.” This legislator was told it was “highly unusual” for someone to get the number of bills through she got through in her freshman term. “I felt in part they were trying to prove they were not discriminating against me.”

Another legislator said she feared more real discrimination in the future because she expects a strong backlash against the demands of women. “I don’t feel I’m militant, but they [the men] think so. There’s been a definite polarization, a real change since I first started in the legislature in 1969.”

## Family Responsibilities

Family considerations and traditional attitudes regarding women’s roles in the family loom large for women holding elective office. Society in general imposes barriers by still dictating that woman’s place is in the home. If she wants to work outside, particularly in such a highly visible and competitive arena as politics, she has to justify herself. One legislator described the problem as follows:

Our society has developed in a way that a man’s first obligation is a financial, supportive one. With that as the reason, he can put the family in a secondary position if it conflicts with his ability to make a living or to do something that he thinks is corollary to his professional future or to his ability to support the family financially.

A woman in our society is given the role of being primarily the molder of the family and the supporter of the family [in a moral sense]. Society at the least gives her a secondary role. Any one of us who shifts that role is in a minority position. A woman whose family is not her first concern is really an odd bird to most of the people.

And for a man, if he should say that one of the children is sick, so he is staying home, or that it is important for his wife or children to participate in something, so he is not going to the office today, he is seen as an odd bird.



During their campaigns, the married women with children had been asked whether their husbands and children approved of their decision to run for office. No one knew of men who were subjected to similar questions.

The legislators agreed that many women voters react negatively to other women (particularly those with young children) competing against men for elective office. The voters have an inclination to compare their schedules against that of the candidate and draw the conclusion that husband and children must be suffering or that the candidate must be an unnaturally aggressive and ambitious woman. The discussants felt that, in the minds of some voters, particularly college educated housewives, a happily married woman legislator with children, and perhaps a career besides, may be seen as a threat. Such a figure is perceived as diminishing the importance of other women's roles within the family and the community. There is some indication that attitudes may be changing as more women return to the work force and as the women's movement takes hold among young people, but the rate of change has not yet caught up with the realities an incumbent legislator must face on the campaign trail.

A number of participants commented that they preferred to stay at home with the children while they were younger (an obvious reason for the relatively advanced age of women serving in legislatures), although they did not go so far as to advise aspiring female politicians to do the same. Indeed, two of the four discussion groups were favorably disposed to encouraging a pregnant candidate to remain in the race despite the fact that her chances for success would be severely reduced on account of her condition. Several legislators with young children tried to emphasize how the children benefit from their mothers' political careers and insisted that they ran for office precisely because they care about their children's futures. None seriously considered making the attempt, however, until after the children were in school full time.

One mother of young children started facing the issue head on when she realized her main problem was women voters in her own age group. She finally said:

Look, I want to tell you very frankly, if I were standing up here and said let me be your school teacher or nurse, you wouldn't find anything wrong. You would not say "she's neglecting her children." It takes as much effort, but you don't view nursing or teaching as glamorous jobs. But when I said "let me be your politician" the whole thing changed. It doesn't take any more time, effort or intelligence; it depends on your attitude about the job. If I said I was teaching, nobody would be wondering about my poor husband. Traditionally that has been a woman's role.

One legislator with grown children regularly shows pictures of their weddings, so the voters will realize that they are grown and that she is not needed at home.

There was a deferential recognition of the husband's role, i.e. it was an understanding husband who made it all possible (although there was no

comment that an understanding wife is helpful to a man in political office). It takes a tremendous amount of stamina to hold two full-time jobs, a political career and managing a home. None of the legislators claimed that it was easy to balance the conflicting demands of the legislature and the family. It was apparent that in many cases there are difficult adjustments in home life for women legislators. More than one legislator wondered how long she could remain in office without jeopardizing her home and husband. It was stated categorically that a sound marriage is one of the most important assets for a female legislator. All the married legislators said they had husbands who strongly supported them, that it would be impossible if they did not, but one added "even so, the more you love your job, the greater the strain." Frequently the husband's ego takes a beating and it helps immeasurably to have an extremely secure husband, one who is confident of his own maleness and his own capabilities.

Husbands of women legislators are distinct subjects of voter concern. One legislator expected to be severely criticized for running again while her husband is ill, despite the fact that he is receiving excellent care in the capital city and himself is urging her to run again. A male legislator whose wife had a similar illness several years ago was not subjected to such criticism.

A number of legislators said they could not have run did they not live in the capital city, or within easy driving distance. It was observed that the laudable efforts to upgrade state legislatures in terms of longer and more frequent sessions, week-end committee meetings, and interim committees, place an increased burden on married women with children, as they are required to spend more and more time away from home. "And I don't care how liberated you are," exclaimed one legislator, "you don't split families." Everyone agreed that in most cases wives go with husbands, but husbands do not go with wives.

It seems that even unmarried women are not immune from traditional attitudes toward women's family obligations. As candidates for office, they feel obliged to demonstrate that they too have a family and are interested in womanly pursuits, and they have devised a number of techniques to deal with the situation. They make it known that they live with their parents and circulate campaign photographs taken with their parents and siblings (to counter opponents' campaign slogans, such as "elect a family man for a family ward"). One unmarried legislator distributes recipe-size index cards printed with her picture and political information on one side and favorite recipes on the other. Another joined a country club to further her "I'm just like you girls" image. A third makes sure that her brothers and sisters campaign with her. Most felt that being single often was a handicap. A married woman noted that a single woman lacked the contacts in a PTA, Scouts group and Y, but at least she could not be charged with neglecting husband and children.

Once it is recognized that a married woman legislator is faced with problems which do not affect her male colleagues, it should also be pointed out that she does reap certain advantages. She is rarely the chief family breadwinner. The fact that the family does not rely on her for financial security (and most of the

women indicated that legislative service constitutes a net financial loss), affects her attitude to her job in a number of ways. It may result in greater independence from pressures exerted by political parties or special interests, insofar as the legislator can face possible electoral defeat with at least financial equanimity. Her decision-making is not encumbered by the knowledge that an entire family depends on her for their livelihood.

Although an increasing number of women have professions other than full-time legislator and housewife, most seem to avoid dividing their attention during the session between their business or law practice and legislative affairs. Several of the lawyers present indicated that they practice only on a very small scale, if at all, while serving as legislators and leave the business in the hands of partners, who in a number of cases turn out to be husbands and sons. The voters benefit from the attitudes of these professional women, insofar as the latter are able to devote nearly full time and attention to legislative business and the concerns of their constituents.

### **The Women's Movement**

A handful of the conference participants wholeheartedly support the movement for women's rights and are active in its behalf. Another handful remain untouched by the movement or its fall-out. The majority of the women legislators have been affected in a number of ways:

- 1) Their self-image is undergoing modification, they are more aware of the strengths and weaknesses of womanhood, and they tend to view their relations with colleagues in the legislature in a different light than in previous years;
- 2) They note changing attitudes, interests and expectations among some voters;
- 3) They are becoming increasingly aware of the significance of issues related to women's rights and, as legislators, are prepared to sponsor or support related legislation;
- 4) There is increasing interest in encouraging more women to run for public office.

The concept of special representation for particular groups in the constituency, including women's groups, was firmly rejected at the conference. A woman legislator it was felt would be derelict in her duty were she to concentrate exclusively, or even chiefly, on so-called women's issues. A legislator has an obligation to represent all the people in her district—men, women, and children.

Notwithstanding agreement on such principles, a number of legislators of all ages, both parties, and differing geographic areas do feel that they carry the added responsibility of representing women. In the words of one experienced legislator, an attorney of advanced middle age and in no way connected with the women's movement:

There is a reason I am there, and I am there for those women who have not voiced their opinions throughout the years, and have been in the background and need a spokesman in their behalf. I definitely recognize women as somewhat special, and children as somewhat special. They have had no voice. Men have been speaking up for years. Women and children for the most part let the men do some of their own fighting, but I am standing up for women.

There was a realization that "because you're a woman you do carry this added responsibility, and if you are black, you carry an additional layer of responsibility."

Some participants argued strongly that women must take the leadership on women's issues. "I did lead the fight for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. If I hadn't taken the initiative, it wouldn't have been done. The men would have had a hundred reasons why 'not now.'" This same legislator noted that she and the woman senator who had carried the ERA in their state would not have prevailed, in her opinion, if both had not been relatively senior.

One of the women who had been a leader for women's legislation said that "when I got into women's issues, I could see the changes in the eyes of my male colleagues who had accepted me as just another legislator."

Some thought the women's movement had given them clout to work effectively for certain issues and felt that both the movement and coverage of women's rights helped make men realize that women are serious. "They are finally becoming convinced that to be elected you have to vote on these issues. Many voted for the Equal Rights Admendment who would not have been caught dead voting for it two years ago." Asked whether this was out of conviction or out of fear, the resounding answer was "fear."

A woman legislator has to be knowledgeable and active in at least two areas: she needs to have a broad base of interest and expertise, but at the same time she has to be a tough, concerned, hard fighter in the area of specialized women and human rights issues. Legislators in many cases distinguish between issues which traditionally have been regarded as important to women (such as education, health, child care) and women's rights issues (such as the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion reform, women's property rights). It was obvious that by and large the legislators regarded so-called women's issues with ambivalence, depending on a variety of considerations among which sex was by no means the controlling factor.

The following views illustrate the attitudes and experience of some of the legislators in regard to women's issues, but do not touch on the wide range of their concerns, which include most of the issues which come before the legislature. There was some feeling that much aggressive social legislation came about because of women and their efforts, and that the presence of women in the legislature was beneficial to the interests of women, children and minority groups. One legislator who relates well to youth commented that she deals with youth-oriented issues, probably because she was asked to by the

men in her legislature. When the issues involve predominantly other adult males, she thought, she would not be asked to take them over.

Another participant feels she has to be constantly on guard against becoming "pidgeon-holed" as interested in women's issues. "I've got to know taxes, even though my interest is ecology." However, she "has to pick up the ball on child care, because a man legislator usually doesn't care, he's not interested." She also led a fight to change a community property rights law which "is a tremendous change for women. We understand and the men don't."

Another legislator said, "child care is my hang up." Part of her job was to provide a "massive education program" for male legislators. "I am primarily an educator in the legislature. They have to be educated to my point of view. Women have to carry our share, plus all the other things."

Women at this moment are forced into the position of sponsoring different kinds of legislation than men to gain acceptance among their colleagues.

In your first term, your colleagues are delighted to have you sponsor education, health, conservation, consumer legislation. Bills on such subjects do not threaten men or hurt your image as a legislator. Also, in the first term you can move into areas other than these where it is known that you have previous experience or expert knowledge. There is a willingness among your male colleagues to recognize expertise. But I waited until my second term to introduce anything to do with women's rights, because then the red flag goes up.

"You have to work at making the gentlemen comfortable with you," responded another, "so that they accept you as a colleague, not as a woman. I shy away from openly backing women's bills. I signed the abortion bill but it was sponsored by a man. I work hard on women's legislation behind the scenes. We may need to do this for the next ten to fifteen years."

Another representative noted that she had had considerable support from men on some women's legislation when she had carried the fight. Among her tactics had been telling the men that she could produce a delegation of a thousand women at the state capital, but "I know you don't want that."

One discussant noted that women are more willing to introduce something controversial, knowing they have no hope of achieving anything that term: for example, a "controversial contraceptive bill. I knew it would go down, but perhaps three sessions from now it will pass." Another added, "If we stop fighting for aid to dependent children and money for contraception and abortion and start fighting for the 65 foot trucks, we'd be more successful. If you want to buck the status quo, it's tougher."

One woman ran for Lieutenant Governor and supported abortion reform. She lost, and when she came back to the Senate, "I didn't get reappointed as minority whip. They didn't wish to have the abortion lady as a minority whip."

Another said she doesn't hesitate to use clout to pressure men to her side on women's issues. "I go into their own communities and let their people know what they do. I say, this man is excellent, and I know he must have an awfully

good reason why he didn't support child care. Some of the men complain that I'm meddling, and I just tell them I wanted them to know how concerned their constituents are on this issue."

Another, speaking as a "very late convert to the women's movement," felt that we have to work to bring out sisters along with us. She noted that some legislators "love the exclusivity of it all. There is a temptation to like to be the exclusive members of the club. It makes us feel more special. If we like keeping the club exclusive there will be nobody to carry the Equal Rights Amendment." The Equal Rights Amendment would not have been ratified in her state without the concerted efforts of the women in the legislature.

Questions about the effects of the women's movement on women in state legislatures received mixed comment. One woman said it made everything more difficult with men. Some had quietly gotten backing for equal rights revisions in state laws until the Equal Rights Amendment nationally became an emotional issue.

A Western delegate feared that the Equal Rights Amendment took "all her chits" to get through the House. It may hurt her moving other bills and may hurt her with the voters. The movement women are counterproductive allies, she believes. She urged them to dress neatly and stressed good behavior when they came to the chamber, and she discouraged a lesbian group from being vocal.

A number of women believe that the Equal Rights Amendment is not a women's issue, but a man's as well. In their states, men have sponsored the Equal Rights Amendment with women listed as co-sponsors.

The method one woman used to get Equal Rights Amendment votes was to ask married male legislators what would happen if they died unexpectedly. Did they have a will? As a widow, she told them her tale of tangles and reminded them that they were part of the law. She felt that men usually wanted the laws changed for the sake of their families.

There was a consensus that the radical elements of the women's movement, more or less derisively referred to as "women's lib," hurt their own cause with the legislators and reflect negatively on women who hold elective office (insofar as these are implicitly assumed to be guilty by association). The theory voiced by several legislators that there is some advantage to having radical groups in your state "who ask for the moon, and then when you advocate half a moon, you seem moderate in comparison," did not receive much support.

Even several strong women's rights advocates voiced concern that "women's liberation is hurting women and government." Legislators who sponsored and helped enact legislation dealing with no-fault divorce, liberalized abortion laws, or ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment stated unequivocally that they could not have been elected had they campaigned as feminists. "I could not have been elected in my area if I campaigned as a feminist. I would have been defeated. I said 'I don't want you to vote for or against me because I am a woman, but vote for me because I know what I am talking about'."

## Women as Candidates

Thanks in large part to the women's movement, women in greater numbers can for the first time entertain running for public office on an equal basis with men, as opposed to a passing era when women got into office as a "fluke, or by marrying a man whose name was put on every billboard and when he died you got in." A good deal of concern was expressed that there might be a backlash, that expectations would be aroused which could not be met, that reapportionment and upgraded legislatures tend to stiffen the competition and make the legislature more appealing to qualified men. There was substantial feeling that women should not run as women, but as qualified citizens; that women "cannot be expected to vote for me just because we both wear skirts, anymore than a man votes for another because they both wear pants."

Regardless of whether the conference participants are optimistic or pessimistic about the goals and impact of the women's movement, they are more or less active in encouraging other women to enter politics. "Since custom expects men to be in politics, something has to be done to encourage women to run."

Many undertake extensive schedules of appearances before groups of women and girls, and urge more women to run for office. Some actively recruit individual women. One legislator has a "training camp" and brings young girls to the capitol, to cabinet meetings, takes them into her office as interns and legislative aides. Another provides technical material for campaigns, advises women on what marginal districts to run in, and speaks constantly to women about raising their low self-image. Several black women work with grass roots drives in their states to organize workshops and to train black women for the purpose of encouraging them to run for office.

One representative who received funds to hire a secretary hired a research assistant instead to help her propose more women's legislation and to train her so that she too can run for office. Several cited instances of former legislative secretaries who were now interested in running for office themselves.

Self-confidence was frequently cited as the single most important ingredient for women in public life. Most believe that women need to acquire a great deal more self-confidence, even those who are politically astute. Through their public appearances before women's groups and working privately with individuals, the women legislators realize that they are acting as models to encourage others.

Women, it seems, are becoming more assertive. One legislator, now in her 60's, described her reaction this way: "I'd been longing to run for the legislature for years. Why didn't I just say, 'Hey, I'd like to be considered?' I'm not headed for the back of the bus anymore." There was no doubt that the women saw the movement as helping to break down traditional attitudes, but also had the feeling that it cannot and should not be done overnight. One legislator said she looks forward to the day when a young woman can do what she wants "without fear of incrimination or discrimination," but that the process may take fifteen to twenty years.

In exhorting her colleagues toward greater efforts on behalf of women, one legislator said:

We have to be careful not to enjoy too much the status of being one of a very tiny number of women legislators. We get used to getting publicity. It's too easy to fall into the trap of appreciating the fact that you are unique and not encouraging other women. Remember the more women there are, the more effective we'll be.

The response was down-beat. "What we need," came the reply, "are more dedicated, full-time legislators. We have put too much emphasis here on the sex thing."

A woman's campaign differs from a man's in several ways. All the legislators agreed that women tend to spend less money. Why does a woman spend less money on her campaign? One assumption is that in general raising money is more difficult for women than men, chiefly because most men have better connections with the business community, whereas traditionally women have tended to operate within the network of community service organizations.

On the other hand, a surprisingly large number of women indicated that they would not take money, certainly not in significant amounts, from large interests in their states. Several legislators had returned campaign contributions received from such sources as union locals or various business organizations. One woman said she always points to the expensive campaign ads of her opponents and asks, "Who's backing him?", thus turning a potential handicap into an asset.

There was general agreement that small contributions are best when it is possible to finance a campaign with them, not only because obligations are not incurred to the same degree to small contributors, but "because it gets more people involved." The women legislators prefer to raise needed funds through rummage sales and various kinds of local parties, rather than through approaching wealthy individual donors or organizations.

It was not possible to draw up a useful comparison of campaign costs insofar as these vary in relation to local conditions in each race. Outlays in general ranged from \$27,000 for a legislator from a suburban district with 75,000 voters to expenditures of several hundred dollars by legislators with 15-20,000 voters in essentially rural and small town districts. Several claim not to have spent a cent. The legislator who spent \$27,000 was naturally forced to accept some large contributions, though she spent \$10,000 out of her own pocket and received considerable help from the party, which was anxious to capture a district always held by the opposition. Others, who had spent considerably less, indicated that a significant proportion of the total came from their own pockets.

Women running for office do not seem to suffer from a shortage of publicity. Most said that good press relations were essential to a successful race, but that because of their high visibility, exposure had never been a problem. The discussants cited advantages when campaigning in a primary among a multiplicity of other candidates, since such a wide field usually included only

one woman among the candidates. In such a race she cannot help but stand out. Once a woman has been elected to the legislature, publicity is more easily come by than it is for most men, thus simplifying future campaigns. Indeed, several women complained of overexposure once they reached the legislature, to the point where they and their families were harassed by all the publicity.

One advantage accruing to women in door-to-door campaigning is that voters may be less hesitant to open the door to a strange woman than to a man. One legislator, whose district includes the suburbs of a metropolitan area and some rural sections, said that her husband made her promise that she would never go alone door-to-door.

All campaigns, whether for men or women, run on a female understructure and are female at the grassroots level. Campaigns for women legislators, however, often accord female staff more responsibility and include more women volunteers than holds true for their male opponents. Everyone agreed that "you rely on women to get elected." Special situations arise when an opponent campaigns on slogans such as "elect a man for a man's job," which were cited by several legislators. According to one participant, the women in her district were furious! Their fury elected her. Women's groups she had never belonged to and women she had not met campaigned for her and drove voters to the polls.

There was a considerable body of opinion that it is easier to elect women from multi-member districts, because the voters "feel you should have at least one woman." Party leaders find it easier to back a woman in a multi-member district. "When they're choosing one person, they choose a man. The trend toward the disappearance of the multi-member district was not regarded as a cause for sorrow in the long run, insofar as more than one woman has hardly ever been chosen in multi-member districts. Their continued existence could be seen as the perpetuation of miniscule representation by women.

Women are in a transitional stage regarding attitudes toward other women holding public office, and it is not unfair to conclude that the legislators' self-image vis-a-vis the women's movement is undergoing comparable reevaluation. A legislator from the mid-West who is relatively active in feminist issues says she is finding all sorts of support from all kinds of women, "not just young or radical women. Our own self-image is changing. When I speak they no longer say 'Gee, you did a good job.' Now the response from women waitresses and secretaries is more, 'I'm so proud of women.'"

In total agreement was a black legislator, who said that even in the conservative area around her state capitol, women come to her and say, "I appreciate what you're doing for women." A woman who has been in the legislature for sixteen years noted that when she first ran many men said she ought to stay home and take care of the children. Today they talk to her about electing a woman governor, because women do a better job.

A Southern legislator said that when she was elected in 1954, she was told that because she was an average housewife, women were not jealous of her and men did not fear her. "Many of my friends were not even registered voters.

Through the years they became involved, chiefly because there was a woman in office. It's a terrific responsibility. If I had failed, there would not have been another woman. You've got to work hard for all your sisters."

Like any gathering of this kind, the conference succeeded in raising more questions than it answered. For example, if women legislators are as competent as they seem to be, why is their ability and effectiveness not reflected in leadership positions in state houses across the country? Why was there so little discussion of power, its acquisition and its use, within a legislative framework? Why was there so little mention of the possible advantages of legislative reform, in terms of increased staff and access to information for all legislators, with an eye to reducing dependence on decision-making at largely male social gatherings outside the legislative halls? If women are indeed such effective and highly visible campaigners, why have other women not tried to emulate them in greater numbers?

## QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

### Series A

1. Why are there so few women state legislators, compared with men?
2. Is it possible to enumerate specific professional or personal problems which confront women legislators?
3. Do these problems differ in substance or degree from those facing male legislators?
4. Are women generally included in the informal delegation deliberations? Are *any* women fully included? If some are and some aren't what accounts for the difference?
5. How fully are women legislators integrated into the party organization in the legislature? If some are and some aren't, what accounts for the difference?
6. What is the attitude of the legislative leaders toward women? Are there women among them? Or close to them?
7. What about committee assignments? Are women legislators given fair consideration? Are the same criteria used in appointing men and women legislators to committees?
8. Are there "women's roles" in the legislature to which women are regularly assigned? What are they?
9. Are there women in the informal influence structures in the party? In the legislature? Are there barriers to equal opportunity for women legislators?
10. Would attitudinal changes on the part of male colleagues make any difference to the work of a woman legislator? On the part of female colleagues?
11. Would institutional or procedural changes in the legislative structure facilitate the work of women legislators?

### Series B

1. Do women make different legislators from men? Are there differences between male and female legislators? What are these? Does a woman legislator use the same methods and means to be an effective legislator as a man?
2. Are there any actual or potential distinctive contributions made by women in the legislature? Actual? Potential? What are they?
3. Are there any "women's issues" that women legislators themselves gravitate to?
4. Do constituency relations of male and female legislators differ? How? Do the interests of women constituents differ from those of male constituents? Any recent changes?

5. Do women have an obligation to focus on representing women? Do women legislators have a special responsibility to represent the interests of women constituents?
6. Has the women's rights movement affected your work as a legislator? Your status as a legislator? Your personal attitudes? Your private life?
7. Do the women legislators abide by the same ethical principles and rules of conduct as men? Should they? If not, why not?
8. Is a certain kind of political image desirable for women legislators? Any recent changes? Has there been a noticeable difference between senior and freshmen women legislators? Are these comparable differences evident between senior and freshmen male legislators?
9. Do family obligations play the same role for male and female legislators? Do other professional obligations play the same role for male and female legislators?

### Series C

1. What are the special problems that confront women interested in running for professional or semi-professional political roles such as state legislator? Personal problems? Political problems?
2. Is raising money a greater problem for women than for men?
3. Do female candidates get as much support from the party organization as male candidates for the same or comparable offices?
4. Do female campaigners face any special problems?
5. Should a female office seeker avoid being considered "too aggressive" as a campaigner? What is too aggressive?
6. Does a female campaigner have any special assets? What are they?
7. Thinking about the electorate generally, is there resistance to voting for women candidates among other women? Among men?
8. Should more women be encouraged to participate in politics?
9. Realistically, how could more women be encouraged to run for elective office?
10. What kinds of women have the best hope of competing for office successfully?
11. Do women need to follow the same career patterns as men to be effective in politics? What are these?
12. To enable more women to run for office on a basis of equality with men, are institutional changes required in party structure?
13. Are attitudinal changes among party elites a prerequisite to enabling more women to compete for office successfully?
14. Are attitudinal changes among women themselves a prerequisite to enabling more women to compete for office successfully.

## PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE

Pocono Manor Inn, Pennsylvania

May 18-21, 1972

### Thursday, May 18, 1972

Afternoon Registration  
6:15 p.m. Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: Welcoming Remarks**  
Ida F. S. Schmertz  
Geri Joseph  
Jeane J. Kirkpatrick  
Donald G. Herzberg  
**Opening Panel: "Women and Politics"**  
The Honorable C. DeLores Tucker  
The Honorable Elizabeth D. Koontz  
Shelia Tobias

### Friday, May 19, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
(8:00-10:00 a.m. 6 interviews)  
10:00 to 12:45 p.m. **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
1:00 p.m. Lunch  
2:00 to 4:45 **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
(5:00-7:00 p.m. 6 interviews)  
6:15 Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: Day Care and Child Development, Role of the States**  
Mary Dublin Keyserling (Moderator), "Magnitude of Need"  
Marjorie G. Elsten, "Creative Use of Federal Child Funds"  
Judith Ann Assmus, "Role of the States in Proposed Federal Child Care Legislation"  
Evelyn Moore, "Optimum Conditions for Minority Involvement in Quality Child Care Development Programming"  
(8:30-10:30 p.m. 6 interviews)

### Saturday, May 20, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
(8:00-10:00 a.m. 6 interviews)  
10:00 to 12:45 **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
1:00 p.m. Lunch  
Afternoon Free  
(2:00-4:00 p.m. 6 interviews)  
(4:30-6:30 p.m. 6 interviews)  
6:15 Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: A Re-examination of Family Law**  
Representative Norma Paulus (Moderator), "The Experience of the Oregon Legislature with No-Fault Divorce"  
Herma Hill Kay, "Making Marriage (and Divorce) Safe for Women"  
Marguerite Rawalt, "Married Women's Property Rights"  
(8:30-10:30 p.m. 6 interviews)

### Sunday, May 21, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
10:00 to 12:30 **Plenary Session: Strengthening the Legislatures**  
Geri Joseph (Moderator), "How Do the Legislatures Work for Women Legislators?" Findings from the Discussion Groups  
Nancy Brown Burkheimer, "The Maryland Legislature and the Women's Caucus"  
Jess Unruh, "First Things First"  
(10:30-12:30 p.m. 6 interviews)  
12:45 p.m. Lunch

**Conference Adjourned**

## PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE

Pocono Manor Inn, Pennsylvania

May 18-21, 1972

### Thursday, May 18, 1972

Afternoon Registration  
6:15 p.m. Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: Welcoming Remarks**  
Ida F. S. Schmertz  
Geri Joseph  
Jeane J. Kirkpatrick  
Donald G. Herzberg  
**Opening Panel: "Women and Politics"**  
The Honorable C. DeLores Tucker  
The Honorable Elizabeth D. Koontz  
Shelia Tobias

### Friday, May 19, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
(8:00-10:00 a.m. 6 interviews)  
10:00 to 12:45 p.m. **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
1:00 p.m. Lunch  
2:00 to 4:45 **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
(5:00-7:00 p.m. 6 interviews)  
6:15 Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: Day Care and Child Development, Role of the States**  
Mary Dublin Keyserling (Moderator), "Magnitude of Need"  
Marjorie G. Elsten, "Creative Use of Federal Child Funds"  
Judith Ann Assmus, "Role of the States in Proposed Federal Child Care Legislation"  
Evelyn Moore, "Optimum Conditions for Minority Involvement in Quality Child Care Development Programming"  
(8:30-10:30 p.m. 6 interviews)

### Saturday, May 20, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
(8:00-10:00 a.m. 6 interviews)  
10:00 to 12:45 **Discussion Groups I-IV**  
1:00 p.m. Lunch  
Afternoon Free  
(2:00-4:00 p.m. 6 interviews)  
(4:30-6:30 p.m. 6 interviews)  
6:15 Cocktails and Dinner  
8:30 **Plenary Session: A Re-examination of Family Law**  
Representative Norma Paulus (Moderator), "The Experience of the Oregon Legislature with No-Fault Divorce"  
Herma Hill Kay, "Making Marriage (and Divorce) Safe for Women"  
Marguerite Rawalt, "Married Women's Property Rights"  
(8:30-10:30 p.m. 6 interviews)

### Sunday, May 21, 1972

7:15 a.m. Breakfast  
10:00 to 12:30 **Plenary Session: Strengthening the Legislatures**  
Geri Joseph (Moderator), "How Do the Legislatures Work for Women Legislators?" Findings from the Discussion Groups  
Nancy Brown Burkheimer, "The Maryland Legislature and the Women's Caucus"  
Jess Unruh, "First Things First"  
(10:30-12:30 p.m. 6 interviews)  
12:45 p.m. Lunch

**Conference Adjourned**



## PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE

### Discussion Group I

**Nancy Brown Burkheimer** (Discussion Group Leader)—President, National Order of Women Legislators; elected to Maryland House of Delegates 1962, 1966

**Myra McPherson** (Rapporteur)—Reporter, *Washington Post and Times Herald*

**Rep. Audrey Beck, D.**  
*Mansfield, Connecticut*

**Rep. Gwendolyn S. Cherry, D.**  
*Miami, Florida*

**Sen. Minette Doderer, D.**  
*Iowa City, Iowa*

**Rep. Milicent Fenwick, R.**  
*Somerville, New Jersey*

**Sen. Edith Miller Klein, R.**  
*Boise, Idaho*

**Rep. Marjorie "Midge" Miller, D.**  
*Madison, Wisconsin*

**Rep. Lois North, R.**  
*Seattle, Washington*

**Sen. Jeanette Reibman, D.**  
*Easton, Pennsylvania*

**Rep. Nelis J. Saunders, D.**  
*Detroit, Michigan*

**Rep. Eleanor P. Sheppard, D.**  
*Richmond, Virginia*

**Rep. Margot Tregoning, D.**  
*Wardner, Indiana*

### Discussion Group II

**Kathryn F. Clarenbach** (Discussion Group Leader)—President, Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women; Professor, Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Extension, Center for Women's and Family Living Education

**Eileen Shanahan** (Rapporteur)—Financial Reporter, *New York Times*

**Rep. Patricia A. Crawford, R.**  
*Devon, Pennsylvania*

**Rep. Goudylock "Giddy" E. Dyer, R.**  
*Hinsdale, Illinois*

**Rep. Nancie Fadeley, D.**  
*Eugene, Oregon*

**Rep. Glee Jones, R.**  
*Hamlin, Kansas*

**Rep. Ann Klein, D.**  
*Morristown, New Jersey*

**Rep. Helen L. Koss, D.**  
*Wheaton, Maryland*

**Rep. Joan Lipsky, R.**  
*Cedar Rapids, Iowa*

**Rep. Dorothy S. McDiarmid, D.**  
*Vienna, Virginia*

**Re. Janet Merritt, D.**  
*Americus, Georgia*

**Rep. Carol W. Tinker, R.**  
*Las Vegas, New Mexico*

**Sen. Clara Weisenborn, R.**  
*Dayton, Ohio*

**Rep. Martha Carole White, D.**  
*Baldwyn, Mississippi*

### Discussion Group III

**Ronnie Eldridge** (Discussion Group Leader)—Deputy City Administrator, New York City

**Patricia Rice** (Rapporteur)—Feature Writer, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*

**Rep. Eugenia Chapman, D.**  
*Arlington Heights, Illinois*

**Rep. Betty Ann Dittmore, R.**  
*Englewood, Colorado*

**Rep. Doris Dorbecker, R.**  
*Indianapolis, Indiana*

**Rep. Joanne M. Duren, D.**  
*Cazenovia, Wisconsin*

**Rep. Daisy Elliott, D.**  
*Detroit, Michigan*

**Rep. Ann Gannett, R.**  
*Wayland, Massachusetts*

**Rep. Jeanette Gelt, R.**  
*Salem, New Hampshire*

**Rep. Judith A. Herndon, R.**  
*Wheeling, West Virginia*

**Rep. Peggy Joan Maxie, D.**  
*Seattle, Washington*

**Rep. Pauline H. Menes, D.**  
*College Park, Maryland*

**Sen. Edna B. Thode, D.**  
*Casa Grande, Arizona*

**Rep. Josephine C. Younkin, D.**  
*Junction City, Kansas*

### Discussion Group IV

**Arvonne S. Fraser** (Discussion Group Leader)—President, Women's Equity Action League

**Catherine Watson** (Rapporteur)—Staff Writer, *Minneapolis Tribune*

**Rep. Milly O. Bernard, D.**  
*Kearns, Utah*

**Rep. Frances Gaylord, R.**  
*West Lafayette, Indiana*

**Rep. Grace T. Hamilton, D.**  
*Atlanta, Georgia*

**Rep. Marie E. Howe, D.**  
*Somerville, Massachusetts*

**Rep. Bernice Kizer, D.**  
*Fort Smith, Arkansas*

**Rep. Muriel Terry McNeill, D.**  
*Hobbs, New Mexico*

**Rep. Mary Martha Merritt, D.**  
*Beckley, West Virginia*

**Rep. Norma Paulus, R.**  
*Salem, Oregon*

**Rep. Georgia B. Peterson, R.**  
*Salt Lake City, Utah*

**Rep. Marion "Buzzy" I. Seibel, R.**  
*Newark, Delaware*

**Sen. Marigene Valiquette, D.**  
*Toledo, Ohio*

### Panelists in Plenary Sessions

- Judith Anne Assmus**—Washington Research Project Action Council, Washington, D.C.
- Nancy Brown Burkheimer, D.**—President, National Order of Women Legislators; elected to Maryland House of Delegates 1962, 1966
- Marjorie G. Elsten**—Legislative Liaison, Office of the Director, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
- Donald G. Herzberg**—Executive Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics
- Geri Joseph**—Contributing Editor, *The Minneapolis Tribune*; Coordinator, Conference Discussion Groups
- Herma Hill Kay**—Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley, California
- Mary Dublin Keyserling**—Economic consultant, lecturer, writer, Washington, D.C., Author, *Windows on Day Care*
- Jeane J. Kirkpatrick**—Associate Professor of Political Science, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Author of forthcoming book on women in American politics
- Elizabeth Duncan Koontz**—Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor and Director of the Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C.
- Evelyn Moore**—Executive Director, Black Child Development Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Representative Norma Paulus, R.**—Salem, Oregon
- Marguerite Rawalt**—Attorney, Arlington, Virginia
- Ida F.S. Schmertz**—Center for the American Woman and Politics, Conference Director
- Shelia Tobias**—Associate Provost and Lecturer in History, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut
- C. Delores Tucker**—Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
- Jess M. Unruh**—Los Angeles, California, Former Speaker of the California Assembly

### Interviewers

- Jeane J. Kirkpatrick**—Associate Professor of Political Science, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. Author of forthcoming book on women in American politics
- Ann Brunsdale**—Publications Director, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D. C.
- Ann Collins**—Fellow of Clinical Sociology, University of Maryland, Silver Springs, Maryland
- Elizabeth Douvan**—Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
- Valerie Earle**—Chairman, Department of Political Science, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
- Victoria Schuck**—Professor of Political Science, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts

### Planning Committee

- Polly Buck**—Former Secretary, Republican National Committee
- Nancy Brown Burkheimer**—President, National Order of Women Legislators
- Charles Davis**—Executive Secretary, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders
- Geri Joseph**—Contributing Editor, *Minneapolis Tribune*
- Anne Klein**—Assemblywoman (D), Morris County, New Jersey
- Ruth B. Mandel**—Center for the American Woman and Politics
- Norma Paulus**—Assemblywoman (R), Salem, Oregon
- Ramona Ripston**—Director, Department of Public Affairs, New York Urban Coalition
- Ida F. S. Schmertz**—Center for the American Woman and Politics
- Ann Scott**—Legislative Vice President, National Organization for Women
- Victoria Schuck**—Professor of Political Science, Mt. Holyoke College

## CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS

### Advisory Committee

Shirley S. Anderson	Dr. Suzanne Keller
Anne Armstrong	Sally Kempton
Lucia H. Ballantine	Assemblywoman Ann Klein
Dr. Alice L. Beeman	The Honorable Arthur S. Lane
Lucy Wilson Benson	Dr. Wynona M. Lipman, Senator
Polly Buck	Lonnie MacDonald, M. D.
Mrs. Mary I. Bunting	Marya Mannes
Mrs. Louis G. Cowan	Assemblywoman Josephine S. Margetts
Rachel B. Cowan	Anne Martindell
Sage Fuller Cowles	Dr. Margaret Mead
Sara Davies	Mrs. Evelyn P. Metzger
Mrs. Douglas Delanoy	Mrs. Robert Meyner
Dean Cecelia Hodges Drewry	Mrs. Katherine Neuberger
Commissioner Millicent Fenwick	The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
Margery Somers Foster	Mrs. Samuel Peabody
Professor Sebastian de Grazia	Harriet F. Pilpel, Esq.
Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths	Ramona Ripston
Beverly Gross, Esq.	Professor Elaine Showalter
August Heckscher	Ellen Stewart
Mrs. Claudia Heckscher	Peggy C. Tyler
Miss Margaret Hickey	Edith Van Horn
Professor Hilda Hidalgo	The Honorable Katharine Elkus White
Professor Arlie R. Hochschild	Miss Blenda J. Wilson
Thomas Hoving	Donald M. Wilson
Geri Joseph	Myra K. Wolfgang

### Executive Committee

Shirley S. Anderson, Co-Chairwoman  
Lucia H. Ballantine, Co-Chairwoman  
Polly Buck  
Sebastian de Grazia  
Peggy C. Tyler

### Directors

Ruth B. Mandel  
Ida F. S. Schmertz

### Faculty, Eagleton Institute of Politics

Donald G. Herzberg, Executive Director  
John C. Blydenburgh  
Sebastian de Grazia  
Emmet John Hughes  
Alan Rosenthal

Center for the American Woman and Politics