UC Santa Cruz
UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

After the Noise of Public Protest Subsides: Case Studies of Oppositional Gender Consciousness and Practices in San Francisco Bay Area Second-Wave Feminist Activists in the Autonomous Women's Movement

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/36d0m9sf

Author

Johnson, Kathryn

Publication Date

2020

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

**AFTER THE NOISE OF PUBLIC PROTEST SUBSIDES:
CASE STUDIES OF OPPOSITIONAL GENDER CONSCIOUSNESS
AND PRACTICES IN SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA SECOND-WAVE
FEMINIST ACTIVISTS IN THE AUTONOMOUS WOMEN'S MOVEMENT**

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

SOCIOLOGY

by

Kathryn Kenley Johnson

March 2020

The Dissertation of Kathryn Kenley
Johnson is Approved:

_____

Professor Craig Reinarman, Chair

_____

Professor Veronica Terriquez

_____

Professor Barbara Epstein

_____

Quentin Williams

Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

After the Noise of Public Protest Subsides:
Case Studies of Oppositional Gender Consciousness and Practices in San Francisco
Bay Area Second-Wave Feminist Activists in the Autonomous Women's Movement.

Kathryn Kenley Johnson

My dissertation addresses the issue of the biographical consequences of
activism and its role in social movement persistence and continuity. Apart from
micromobilization studies, social movement scholars neglect individual activists'
roles as precursors of collective action. My study explores how the institutional
workplace and domestic arrangements of former feminist activists affected their
ability to translate their beliefs into oppositional gender practices that function as
bridges between protest cycles. This project is a qualitative case study using in-depth,
semi-structured interviews with respondents chosen and compared on the basis of
their sexual preferences and their post-movement career choices.

Comparisons of the workplace practices of respondents in different
occupational categories demonstrate the influence of institutional arrangements.
Those in male-dominated fields implemented their practices during their working
hours. Those in female-segregated jobs could only implement their practices after
hours or in the community. Together, their practices produced feminist knowledge
and pedagogy, women's rights advocacy, hierarchal inversion, democratization, and
workplace islands of community and care. For respondents working outside of
bureaucratic organizations, institutional arrangements were less influential than
lesbian identity, inherited wealth, a totalist mindset, and personal qualities.

In the domestic arena, cultural rather than structural factors influenced my respondents' oppositional practices. Emotional ties created the glue sustaining communal living. Households with a core couple, relatives, and friends were the most stable, followed by households without a couple core or blood ties, but based on friendships, shared work, or political interests, and lastly, by households relying on the rental market for communards.

My respondents' practices contributed to women's movement persistence through their individual acts and through the impacts their practices had and continue to have on those around them. Like Whalen's and Flacks's new left activists (1989), my respondents found partners, had children, and added activities that met emotional and spiritual needs ignored during the movement's heyday, but did not become apolitical, and all continued to contribute to feminism.

My respondents' practices initiated an ever-widening two-way "bridge," enabling individuals in their orbits of influence to adopt their beliefs, emulate their behaviors, identify like-minded others, including the social movement organizations they might join. These practices' existence helped those organizations send a resonating message to potential recruits.

As my contribution to social movement scholarship, I introduce the concepts of "not fitting" to characterize respondents' grievances; " feminist dilemmas" and "oppositional gender practices" to describe respondents' translation process; "islands of care" as a type of free space; and "institutional arrangements" as political opportunities, and "interim practices" to describe the strategic role of practices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, above all, I want to thank the women who invited me into their homes and shared their stories. Needless to say, this dissertation would never have begun or finished without you. Thank you for your trust that I would convey your experiences honestly.

A friend told me that I have been writing this dissertation all my life. As a second-wave feminist myself, that is true. I have many people to thank along the way: Professor Craig Reinarman, my chair, and committee members Barbara Epstein, the late Wally Goldfrank, who also was my graduate program advisor, and Veronica Terriquez, who kindly and graciously stepped in following Wally's death.

Professor Reinarman's book *American States of Mind: Political Beliefs and Behavior Among Private and Public Workers* inspired me to ask him to serve as my committee chair. I wanted to learn his methodological and analytical approach so that I could replicate it in my own way. I have not been disappointed. I thank him for his insights, his clear, timely direction, enjoyable conversations, and most of all, for his patience. I miss Professor Goldfrank's warmth and good humor. As my advisor, he helped me navigate the shoals of graduate school and taught me the logic of inquiry as my teacher, my advisor, and my orals and dissertation committee member. Thanks also to Professor Veronica Terriquez who kindly agreed to serve on my committee in the aftermath of Professor Wally Goldfrank's death.I want to express my gratitude and affection for History Professor Barbara Epstein as the outside committee member. Professor Epstein's perspective was so valuable in putting my second-wave

feminists in their historical context. As with Wally Goldfrank, she and I go way back. She is a woman of true integrity and much kindness. A final acknowledgment for Pam and Michael Rosenthal, P&M Editorial Services. They are terrific at what they do and great to work with. Highly recommended!

My dissertation would never have been finished if it had not been for friends and colleagues. Above all I thank San Francisco State University political science professor Joel Kassiola, the former Dean of the College of Behavior and Social Sciences. As Dean, Joel saw his job as empowering his staff and faculty to play to their strengths to do their best. As BSS Coordinator of Special Projects, I was grateful to him for allowing me time to develop an SFSU public lecture series in honor of Women's History Month, and an interdisciplinary seminar on feminist scholarship and women and gender studies. I enjoyed the opportunity to collaborate with him for nine years as volunteer faculty member on the annual fall public lecture series, BSS 275, an interdisciplinary course and public lecture series on a variety of topics about public policy and social justice.

I want to express my appreciation for my long-term friend, Kay Trimberger, Professor Emerita Women's Studies, Sonoma State University and for Roberta Guise, Nicky Trasvina, and Lina Malova. Kay Trimberger read and liked my prospectus and pushed me forward and supported me since. My friend Nicky Trasvina lifted my spirits with long walks on the beach when needed. My young friend Lina Malova's energy and spirit inspires me about the next feminist generation. And my colleague

DEDICATION

To the women in my family: my maternal grandmother Margaret, who marched in Budapest with Hungarian suffragette Rosika Schwimmer, for Hedda, who introduced me to the world of ideas, and for Brigitta, my surrogate mother, who faced down the Arrow Cross knocking at her door.

CHAPTER 1. THE SECOND-WAVE FEMINIST MOVEMENT: PERSISTENCE IN EVERYDAY LIFE

> Women
> Men [sic] make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past.
>
> – Karl Marx

More than 50 years have passed since Betty Friedan wrote *The Feminine Mystique*. Since that time, American women's lives have changed dramatically. In 1960, women were 32.3 percent of the U.S. workforce (Wells 1960). Most women worked as secretaries, nurses, or schoolteachers. In 1960, 94 percent of doctors were white men, as were 96 percent of lawyers (Hsieh et al. 2012). Newspaper ads listed male and female want ads separately. Trade unions blocked women from jobs as firefighters, police officers, plumbers, or electricians. Few women held elected office or owned their own businesses. Women could not get credit or buy a home. Remaining single or choosing not to have children meant inviting derision, suspicion, and isolation. Seventy-three percent of families consisted of heterosexual married couples living with their children (Livingston 2014). Divorce was difficult to obtain. Abortion was illegal. Lesbians remained "in the closet."

By the beginning of the twenty-first century women constituted 47 percent of the U.S. labor force (Women's Bureau 2010). One third of all doctors and lawyers are women (Hsieh et al. 2012). As a result of the 2018 midterm elections, 24 percent of U.S. Congressmembers are women (DeSilver 2018). The stigma of "spinsterhood" is gone. Same-sex marriage is legal. There are many kinds of families—single mothers with children, stepparent blended families, extended multigenerational households, cohabiting gay and straight couples, and formal and informal adoptive parenting arrangements. Divorce is "no-fault." Although threatened, abortion is legal (Dizard and Gadlin 1990; Skolnick and Skolnick 1993; Coontz 1998, 2000, and 2011; Coontz, Parsons, and Raley 1999).

Second-wave feminists, so named because they followed in the footsteps of 1920s first-wave suffragettes, were bellwethers for these changes, now accepted as commonplace. They fought for reproductive rights, equal pay, and equal opportunity. They opened doors for women in predominantly male-dominated professions and trades, challenged the media's stereotyped gender images and religion's male-biased liturgy, introduced egalitarian ways of working, and pioneered the redefinition of marriage, male involvement in parenting, the choice to remain single or child-free, communal living, cohabitation, donor insemination, and lesbian parenting. Their demands prefigured future societal needs and the tensions that would arise between bureaucratic rationality and the culture of care they had left behind as they entered the workforce (Collier, Rosaldo, and Yanigasako 1982; Hartsock 1983; Hochschild 1989 and 1997; Kittay 1999; Folbre 2001; Fields 2004; Rosen 2007).

From the late '60s to the mid-'70s, these feminists captured the front pages of

the mass media and the public's imagination. Fueled by the failed promise of

President John F. Kennedy's Presidential Commission on the Status of Women and

by the anger of dissident female, civil rights, student, and antiwar activists, the

autonomous radical women's movement, so named because these women split from

mixed organizations of men and women, spread across the country like wildfire, by

word of mouth, and through consciousness-raising groups, protests, sit-ins, mass

demonstrations, and marches (Evans 1979 and 2003; Echols 1989; Rosen 2000).

Feminist manifestos, position papers, and pamphlets ricocheted through underground

networks from coast to coast (*Women: A Journal of Liberation* 1969; Tanner 1970;

Johnson and Sommers 1972; Baxandall and Gordon 2000). The mass media was

quick to amplify the movement's message (Davidson 1969).

In less than a decade, a reported 100,000 women joined consciousness-raising

groups, often held in private living rooms (Shreve 1989). These women, joined by

thousands of others, started women's health clinics, organized self-defense groups

and auto repair classes, opened women's bookstores and childcare centers,

established rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters, and created guerilla

theater and art groups (Morgan 1970; Freeman 1975; Cassell 1977; Shreve 1989;

Rosen 2000). Empowered by these experiences, these women sought to enter

predominantly male workplaces by enrolling in graduate, professional and trade

schools. Once in those workplaces, they formed caucuses in trade unions and in

professional associations and demanded access to union apprentice programs and

blue-collar and professional jobs as well as entry into the corporate executive suite. Within higher education, these women challenged the traditional male-biased canon by creating women's studies programs and women's centers. At the K-12 level, these women developed feminist social studies and literature curricula, encouraged young girls to take science and computer classes, and fought for access to athletic programs. Outside the academy, women's presses, magazines, and music and art festivals cracked open the hegemonic gender ideology with questions about women's place and visions of an androgynous, "sexually-liberated" future.

Multiple perspectives emerged—liberal feminist (Friedan 1963), radical feminist (Millet 1970; Firestone 1970), Marxist and socialist feminist (Benston 1969; Dalla Costa and James 1972; Mitchell 1972; Zaretsky 1973; Rowbotham 1974; Hansen and Philipson 1990; Holmstrom 2002; Hartmann 2003)—each with its own analysis of the origins, manifestations, and reproduction of women's inequality and oppression, and as a consequence, each with its own solutions to problems and visions for the future. The scope of the women's movement touched all society's institutions—the state, the economy, the family, education, religion, media, and the worlds of art, music, dance and theater. The feminist mantra "the personal is political" meant individual transformation in addition to structural and cultural change was needed (Haber 1979). Feminists fought for economic self-sufficiency, the right to personal achievement, to have careers, and to have creative and sexual expression. They demanded to participate in civic life and called for an end to the media's misogynist portrayal of women as sex objects, breeders, wives, and muses.

4

Questions about the meaning of the "category of woman," the need to end women's subordination to men, and a critique of the dynamics of society's enforcement of normative heterosexuality underlay their demands. Schooled in caring work in the home, demanding to enter the workforce, these women challenged the accepted capitalist social relations of work, sexuality, reproduction, and family (Yates 1975; Echols 1989; Baxandall and Gordon 2000; Rosen 2000; Evans 2003). Liberal, radical, Marxist and socialist feminists agreed that women's equality and representation in the established order was a minimum required to meet their demands. Radical, Marxist and socialist feminists wanted more than inclusion. Nothing less than the transformation of gender relations, the reorganization of the family, the end of patriarchy, and the smashing of monogamy would count as success. For Marxist and socialist feminists, these demands could only be achieved through the revolutionary transformation of the existing capitalist system (Hansen and Philipson 1990).

Over the time period beginning in 1975 and into the early '80s, the women's movement dissipated as an ongoing, mass movement (Echols 1989; Rosen 2000; Evans 2003). The Marxist and socialist feminist wings had been eclipsed by cultural feminism. Cultural rather than structural explanations of inequality gained prominence (Echols 1989). Although many of the radical feminist cultural institutions remained, a lot of the bookstores, women's centers, and music festivals had downsized or closed. The liberal wing continues to exist, but its organizations depend on professional staffs rather than on grassroots energy. The public's interest had turned away.

5

Factors external to the women's movement, in part, explained this change. The end of the Vietnam War, postwar economic conditions, and the resurfacing of underlying, systemic institutional barriers to women's participation in the workplace and in civil society sapped the movement's vitality. Opposition to the Vietnam War had mobilized the '60s New Left, the student movement, and the antiwar movements. For '60s women, the general climate of opposition had buoyed the women's movement and served as a source for recruits. Participation in the "Movement" had shaped their oppositional consciousness against the "state" and against the patriarchal behavior they encountered working with men in mixed organizations. Economic recession marked the postwar period, increasing my respondent's concerns about their futures. The war's end left the New Left and the women's movement without their energizing catalyst. In this vacuum, feminist activists, now older, began to think about issues of family, children, and career.

During the Reagan years and into the '90s, the mainstream press was quick to pronounce the death of the women's movement, blaming the victim for its demise. Headlines like "Voices from the Post-Feminist Generation" (Bolotin 1982) and "Too Late for Prince Charming" (Salholz et al. 1986) appeared in magazines and newspapers, often on the covers and front pages. Journalists and pundits wasted no time pointing out the folly of second-wave feminist aspirations to combine motherhood with careers and "have it all" (Faludi 1991a; Hickey 1991; Saltzman 1991; Kaminer 1993). Even conservative women academics joined the chorus (Hewlett 1986; Sommers 1994).

Feminist sociologists Hochschild (1989) and Gerson (1985) and historian Rosen (2000) labeled the second-wave feminist women's movement a "stalled," a "subtle," and an "unfinished" revolution respectively. Hochschild, Gerson, and Rosen's arguments attribute the women's movement's dissolution as a mass movement to patriarchal resistance to a shared division of household labor and parenting, to the private sector's refusal to implement family-friendly employment policies and promote women's career advancement, and, finally, to the state's unwillingness to support publicly funded child care. Certainly, the factors these scholars cited played a role in the women's movement's devolution. However, to paraphrase a quip attributed to Mark Twain, rumors of the death of the women's movement were greatly exaggerated. The '60s women's movement has been transformed, and its ideas and values transmitted by successive generational cohorts (Whittier 1995).

Evidence of Second-Wave Persistence and Continuity

Despite the absence of an ongoing mass women's movement, the number of women turning out for specific feminist mass demonstrations has risen considerably over time. In 1970, 20,000 women marched on Fifth Avenue in New York City for women's right to abortion (Ferree and Martin 1985). In 1986, 80,000 women joined the Washington, DC March for Women's Lives. In 1989, this number rose to 300,000. In 1992, the figure was 500,000. In 2004, 1.2 million women assembled in Washington, DC to protest the impending danger to *Roe v. Wade* posed by the two vacancies on the U.S. Supreme Court (Freeman N.d.).

In the intervening years, the women's movement has globalized. Ever since

2012, the One Billion Rising global campaign had mobilized women every year on

February 14, Valentine's Day, to demand an end to violence against women. In public

actions in over 200 countries, women dance, sing, and perform to demonstrate their

opposition. On January 21, 2017, five million women gathered in Washington, DC, in

cities across the U.S., and across the globe to protest the inauguration of President-

elect Donald J. Trump (Kauffman 2018), In that same year, U.S. actress Alyssa

Milano posted on Twitter, "If all the women who have been sexually harassed or

assaulted wrote 'Me too.' as a status, we might give people a sense of the magnitude

of the problem" (Sayej 2017). The next month, 1.7 million women in 85 countries

responded (Park 2017). An international movement to end sexual violence was born.[1]

Despite mass media proclamations that the second-wave women's movement

was dead, national opinion polls reported that, 43 percent of women surveyed in the

conservative 1990s consistently expressed a positive attitude towards the women's

movement (Alfano 2005). Among young, tech-savvy women, feminist identification

has increased. According to a 2014 *Buzzfeed* survey of 300,000 individuals, 69

percent of women called themselves feminists. Among the 31 percent rejecting that

label, 67 percent said that they believed in gender equality, but the feminist label did

not accurately represent their beliefs, as in "I am not a feminist, but. . ." (Dalton

2014).

Voting differences between men and women in the 2008 and 2016

presidential elections show second-wave feminist values persist. Feminist Majority

Foundation president Eleanor Smeal (1997) uses the term "gender gap" to stand for the disparity between female and male concerns and support for so-called women's issues traditionally identified with the Democratic Party—childcare, opposition to domestic violence, public education, and health care. Although presidential candidate Hillary Clinton did not win enough Electoral College votes to secure the presidency, she was the first female nominated by the Democratic Party as a candidate for the highest office in the land. Most important, she secured 2.9 million more popular votes than her rival, Republican Donald J. Trump (CNN 2016).

Launched in the movement's heyday, feminist institutions continue to survive, even flourish and grow. Today, there are more than 605 women's, gender, and feminist studies programs, departments, and research centers in the U.S. higher education system. Women's caucuses proliferate in academic professional associations (Reynolds, Shagle, and Venkataraman 2007). Institutionalization does not necessarily mean "selling out" and "cooptation." Rather, institutionalization offers the opportunity for "outsiders" to form alliances with "insiders" to achieve second-wave women's movement goals (Staggenborg and Taylor 2005).

Women continue to make inroads into formerly male bastions. Today, more young women than men enroll in college and universities, with a ratio of 56.4 to 43.6 (Marcus 2017). Nationwide, 100 hospitals now house women's health clinics (Becker's Hospital Review 2017). While progress is slow, the National Women's Political Caucus, the National Organization for Women, Emily's List, and EMERGE continue to work to promote the election of women to public office. Women now

hold senior leadership positions in Protestant denominations and in the Rabbinate

(Katzenstein 1998). For better or worse, women are 203,000 (14.5 percent) of the

active duty U.S. armed forces of nearly 1.4 million (Patten and Parker 2011).

The severity of the perceived threat that the women's movement posed for the

Christian Evangelical right can be regarded as an indicator of the women's

movement's strength. Groups within the Christian Evangelical right, such as the

Family Research Council, have formed an umbrella coalition called the Arlington

Group. These groups mount "culture wars" for traditional family values, campaign

for conservative legislators, and push to end legalized abortion and to prohibit same-

sex marriage.

How, then, to explain the discrepancy between the absence of an ongoing,

mass women's movement and the evidence of the movement's continued ability to

mobilize public demonstrations, raise the general population's feminist awareness,

affect voting patterns, make institutional changes, break down barriers for women in

predominantly male occupations, and finally, spark a conservative backlash? Put

another way, what happens to a social movement when the noise of public protest

subsides? Answering this question leads to others. Do social movements have clear

beginnings and endings? Resource mobilization and political process theorists posit

cycles of protest and a dormant state during lulls between mass mobilizations (Tarrow

1994). Are social movements really dormant between protest cycles? What kinds of

factors contribute to social movement continuity and persistence? How do scholars'

assumptions about and definitions of a social movement's characteristics influence

their answers? In a movement's aftermath, what do former activists think, feel, and do in their everyday lives? In what way do their actions contribute to social movement persistence and continuity?

The Biographical Consequences of Activism

With the exception of a small number of studies about the biographical consequences of '60s activism on activists' lives on the process of movement recruitment, social movement scholars have paid little attention to the contribution activists make as individuals to movement persistence. From the late '60s to the early '90s, scholarly research on the biographical consequences of activism countered the media narrative that former '60s activists had rejoined the mainstream (Flacks 1967, 1971; Fendrich and Tarleau 1973; Fendrich 1974, 1993; Foss and Larkin 1976; Fendrich 1977; Nassi and Abramovitz 1978; Orcutt and Fendrich 1980; Whalen and Flacks 1980; Hoge and Ankney 1982; DeMartini 1985). This research focused on changes in former activists' '60s attitudes and beliefs over time, not on how the conditions of former activists' lives favored or hindered the persistence of their beliefs and their choices. Aside from Whalen and Flacks's (1989) and Klatch's (1999) social psychological qualitative case studies, data for these studies relied on surveys of activist students on the researchers' own campuses, on activists in national databases, or on activists in specific '60s national protest subgroups such as the civil rights, antiwar, or student movements. With the exception of those social psychological studies (Bengston 1974; Braungart 1974, 1990; Braungart and

11

Braungart 1984) that tested political generations theory, this research was descriptive, not analytical.2

Moreover, with the exception of McAdam's (1992) "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer," women merely appeared as a demographic variable; gender was not a category of analysis.3 Whalen and Flacks's (1989) typology of former '60s activists as "persisters," "disengaged radicals," and "left liberals" was based on activists' occupational choices and their opinions about politics, work, and foreign policy, not on their opinions about the private sphere of family and community.4 The two authors found that over time former '60s activists become more "individuated" from their prior identification with the movement and more conventional in their attitudes. Do Whalen and Flacks's findings about the movement of former activists towards "conventionalization" and "individuation" mean the same thing for female activists as they do for male activists? (Whalen and Flacks 1989:147–56). According to Eleanor Smeal (1997), President of the Feminist Majority Foundation, women are more likely than men to oppose violence in international and domestic disputes and to support health and human services and women's rights. Had Whalen and Flacks taken Smeal's "gender gap" into account, their categorization of individuation and conventionalization might have been different. This question also applies to Klatch's (1999) study, which compares '60s activists with their conservative counterparts and reaches the same conclusions as Whalen and Flacks. Without the memoirs by famous second-wave feminist activists (Friedan 1977; Morgan 1977; Jong 1994; Dunbar-Ortiz 2002; Povich 2012) and

12

anthologies of second-wave feminists' essays (Laslett and Thorne 1997; Duplessis, and Snitow 1998), there would be no record of the biographical consequences of '60s feminist activism.

The research that does exist about former activists in the civil rights, the student, and the antiwar movements documents that, contrary to the mass media's claims, these activists do persist in their '60s beliefs and are less likely to pursue careers in business and work in corporate structures or in the military. Instead, former activists choose to work in education, social services, or in government occupations consistent with their '60s social justice values. Former '60s activists also vote progressively, have less traditional religious orientations, marry later, and are less likely to have children than their non-activist counterparts (Maidenburg and Meyer 1970; Fendrich and Tarleau 1973; Fendrich 1974; Foss and Larkin 1976; Nassi and Abramovitz 1978; Braungart and Braungart 1980; Orcutt and Fendrich 1980; Hoge and Ankney 1982; Marwell, Arkin, and Demerath 1987; McAdam 1989; Sherkat and Blocker 1991).

Social movement scholars have also examined individual activists via micromobilization studies. These studies address the question of why some, but not all, individuals are willing to join social movements (Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam and Paulsen 1993). Micromobilization is defined as the "various interactive and communicative processes that affect frame alignment" (Snow et al. 1986:1), the process by which an individual becomes receptive to joining a social movement because their values, beliefs, and interests align with the social movement's ideology,

goals, and activities. Applying Goffman's (1974) concept of frame analysis to bridge the theoretical gap between the social psychological and resource mobilization approaches, the authors develop the concept of frame alignment to remedy the problems they consider inherent in micromobilization research: that grievances are seen as ubiquitous instead of constituency-specific, that they are seen as static instead of varying as dissent sharpens and the movement progresses, and finally, that grievances are overgeneralized rather than tailored to the types of recruitment tactics used. As I intend to show in my concluding chapter, oppositional gender practices can be used to specify the frame alignment by providing situationally specific information that is useful to social movements seeking to align their messages to potential recruits.5

Mainstream Social Movement Theories: Conceptual Blinders

Mainstream resource mobilization and political process social movement theorists (Gamson 1975; Zald and McCarthy 1979; Tilly 1978; Jenkins 1983; Klandermans 1986; Tarrow 1998) are ill-equipped to answer my questions about what happens after the noise of public protest subsides. Analysis of social movement outcomes is hard enough. How best to measure success? The length of time between mass mobilization and its impact is difficult to measure. Intervening events may confound an assessment of movement impact. Outcomes may exist, but they may not be the ones anticipated (Amenta and Casen 2004). Answering such questions becomes even more difficult because mainstream social movement theorists ignore a basic fact. When movement organizations disband, their former members return to

their everyday lives at home and at work. Although they may leave movement

organizations, they carry those organizations' beliefs and practices with them. With

the exception of research on micromobilization and on the biographical consequences

of activism, the sociological study of social movements focuses on collective, not

individual, actions. Here, in everyday life, I believe, instances of movement-inspired

continuity and persistence are to be found.

Mainstream theorists' inattention to everyday life can be traced to their

assumptions about a social movement's appropriate unit of analysis, the appropriate

arena for political struggle, the nature of legitimate movement demands, the suitable

strategies and tactics, and the criteria for success. These assumptions have created

conceptual blinders that have prevented scholars from acknowledging and theorizing

the implications of the '60s women's movement's distinctive features and the

relationship between those features and political activity in the time between protest

cycles. These assumptions include the following beliefs: that the social movement

organization (SMO), seen as a large, hierarchically structured, centralized, mass

organization, is the appropriate unit of analysis, that the public arena of the state is the

appropriate target for challenge; that legitimate demands center around redistributing

resources and challenging power held in a few hands; that social change takes place

through the political process using tactics ranging from nonviolent means such as

walkouts, strikes, demonstrations, sit-ins, marches, rallies, lobbying, legislation to

violent means including armed struggle; and finally, that legislative passage, trade

union victories, and taking state power are signs of a movement's success (Gamson

1975). Political process theorists such as Eisinger (1973), Klandermans and Oegema (1987), McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald (1996), and Tarrow (1998, 2004) broadened resource mobilization's horizons in the late '80s and '90s by introducing the concept of "political opportunities" external to the SMO that included relations between SMO challengers, other challengers, and the state. However, these theorists did not alter their focus on the SMO, on the state as a target, on the types of legitimate demands and targets, or on the SMO as a social movement's boundaries. Tarrow (1998) even speaks of a social movement industry and a social movement sector composed of multiple SMOs. The assumptions held by resource mobilization and political process theorists had the effect of placing much of the women's movement's activities outside the scope of these theorists' scholarly interests. These activities—not all of which were associated with the radical autonomous women's movement—were not directed against the state or conditions at the workplace, but took place within the family, in the community, and in educational, religious, and cultural institutions. The work of challenging the assumptions and boundaries of mainstream social movement theory would be left to feminist and new social movement scholars.

Feminist and New Social Movement Scholarship on '60s Women's Movement

Academic writings about the second-wave feminist movement began to appear in the mid-'70s. Buoyed by the movement's groundswell and by its academic arm, women's studies, many former feminist activists went to graduate school and were now established academic sociologists, political scientists, and historians.

Feminist social movement scholarship on the '60s women's movement (Freeman 1975; Evans 1979; Echols 1989; Rosen 2000) focused on remedying the absence of scholarship on the '60s women's movement (Breines 1988; Martinez 1989). These writings accomplished much more than correcting the historical record. By bringing attention to the distinctive features of the '60s women's movement that did not fit neatly into the mainstream resource mobilization and political process theoretical assumptions and categories, these scholars challenged resource mobilization and political process's core assumptions and categories. Particularly important for my research, they challenged the idea that social movement activities occur only within the parameters of classic SMO boundaries. Transcending simple critique, these scholars developed new categories to identify and analyze social movement activity during times when mass public mobilization activity was absent.

At first, feminist social movement scholars Mansbridge (1986), Costain (1992), and Staggenborg and Taylor (1995) applied resource mobilization and political process theories to remedy the absence of scholarship on the second-wave feminist movement. These scholars' research focused on the public sphere and the state. They accepted the centrality of the SMO as they respectively analyzed the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment, the trajectory of the pro-choice movement before and after the passage of the 1973 legislation to legalize abortion, and lastly, the role of the state in responding to proposed legislation on women's issues. Their research focused on the liberal women's movement wing, not the radical autonomous women's liberation wing, and examined large, centralized, hierarchically organized

organizations like the National Organization for Women, the Women's Equity Action League, and Planned Parenthood. which, not surprisingly, most closely resembled the mainstream paradigm's SMO model.

In the '90s and into the 2000s, new social movement scholars challenged the dominant resource mobilization and political process paradigms. Goodwin and Jasper (2004), Morris and Mueller (1992), Polletta (2004), Laraña, Johnson, and Gusfield (1994), Darnovsky, Epstein, and Flacks (1995), and Buehler (1993) pointed out that the civil rights, the antiwar, the student, and the women's movements did not conform to the expectations of resource mobilization and political process theories. Sixties movement features—its cross-class constituencies, its non-economic demands, its focus on identity and culture, its distinctive tactics, and its alternative organizational forms—did not fit their model. These theorists took resource mobilization and political process to task for what they called the "structuralist approach"—an excessive reliance on static, invariant, deterministic structures—and for defining political opportunities too narrowly by focusing on the state (Goodwin and Jasper 2004). New social movement theorists argued against the determinist implications of resource mobilization and political process theorists in favor of a "constructivist approach" predicated on actors' agency and process.

For new social movement theorists, the analytical starting point is the actor's interpretive framework—the terrain of subjectivity, meaning, and emotions that illuminate "individual motivations, strategic choices, movement trajectories, internal conflicts and cultures" (Gould 2004:157). How social movement participants frame

18

concerns, interpret threats, and envision opportunities is critical (Snow et al. 1986).

New social movement theorists criticized resource mobilization and political process structuralists for failing to acknowledge the role that culture, emotions, and collective identity play in shaping interpretive schema and subsequent actions (Melucci 1980; Morris and Mueller 1992; Goodwin and Jasper 2004).

In the intervening years, feminist social movement scholars had made considerable headway in correcting the gender imbalance in social movement scholarship. *Gender and Society's* 1998 special double issue, "Gender and Social Movements," edited by Verta Taylor and Nancy Whittier, two leading feminist social movement scholars signaled that the topic of gender and social movements had arrived. The issue's contributors shared the new social movement theorists' critique of resource mobilization and political process theories and agreed with their focus on emotions, agency, and culture. In fact, feminist social movement scholars went further. Reger and Taylor's 2002 article, "The Women's Movement and Social Movement Research: A Symbiotic Relationship" served as a shot across the bow. While acknowledging that resource mobilization and political process theories had given feminist scholars tools to analyze the women's movement, Reger and Taylor pointed out that the women's movement's distinctive features, in turn, provided feminist scholars with a veritable goldmine of evidence to challenge mainstream theories about the SMO as the unit of social movement analysis, the state and the workplace as the only arenas for political struggle, and the activities of social movements as limited to instances of mass public mobilization.

First, Ferree and Martin pointed out that the resource mobilization and

political process model of an SMO (a large, centralized, hierarchical structure with a

dues-paying membership) did not fit the organizational forms that the autonomous

radical wing of the women's movement assumed (consciousness-raising groups, local

issue-oriented projects, women's centers, bookstores, health clinics, rape crisis

centers, and battered women's shelters). Like much of the New Left, the radical

autonomous women's movement tried to create flat, not hierarchical, and local, not

national, decentralized organizations to realize their visions of democratic

participation. Feminist activists often adopted consensus decision-making strategies,

sometime employing rotating leadership to avoid, not always successfully, a star

system of a few feminists anointed by the media.[6]

Second, the broad scope of the women's movement's vision and its demands

for changes in the institutions of marriage and the family, in education, medicine,

religion, media, and culture had inspired feminist struggles in all these arenas. The

existence of these multiple sites of feminist struggles made it easy for Katzenstein

(1998), Staggenborg (1989), Taylor and Rupp (1993), and Taylor (2010) to argue that

'60s women's movement struggles took place not just through contentious politics

against the state, but all across society's institutions—the church, the military, the

health care and education systems, the nonprofit sector, cultural institutions, and

political advocacy groups. Feminist activists used different tactics inside these

institutions than those tactics they used in their struggles against the state.

Katzenstein's case study of women in the Catholic Church and in the U.S. military,

Faithful and Fearless: Feminist Protest Inside the Church and the Military (1998),

documents the ways that feminist protest continued inside these institutions in the

form of "meaning-making," and using tactics of "discursive organizing": oral and

written communication via conversation, newsletters, debates, essays, stories, and

conferences. Taylor's research on breast cancer and self-help groups reaches inside

medical institutions to argue that these self-help groups in hospitals and clinics

confront gender stereotypes, institutional practices, and public policies. These groups

mobilized women using the framing language of gender differences and a critique of

the idyllic conceptions surrounding motherhood. Similarly, Staggenborg's 1996 study

of the Bloomington, Indiana women's movement extends the women's movement

into higher education in the form of knowledge production— the creation of feminist

scholarship and women's studies programs, and, in the community, the Bloomington

rape crisis center. Taylor and Rupp's research (2004) on the lesbian movement details

lesbians' use of wedding ceremonies and rituals in front of city halls to make their

demands for legalizing gay and lesbian marriage visible. Events like the National

Women's Music Festival celebrate women's values, promote solidarity, and are ways

to recruit new members. In her case study of the National Organization for Women's

local chapters, Reger (2001) shows how different chapters frame mainstream

ideology about motherhood to meet varying constituencies.

Third, and particularly relevant to my research's focus on the existence of

political activity between mass mobilizations, Taylor (2010) challenged resource

mobilization's and political process' characterizations of social movement change as

a process that begins with a catalytic event, proceeds through a cyclical process of rise and fall of organized political activity, and ends in a dormant state until the next catalytic event emerges. Tarrow (1994, 1998), a major proponent of the cyclical, rise and fall view of social change, identifies a series of steps that characterizes a social movement's trajectory—changes in political opportunities and constraints that create a catalyzing event, diffusion of information that spreads and rises into larger protests, emerging distinctions between protest's center and its periphery, followed by demobilization created by factional conflicts. Picking up the latter point, Taylor (2010) and others argued, instead, for a more continuous view of movements as having thresholds and turning points that scholars had previously mistaken as "births" and "deaths."

The discovery that the '60s women's movement did not fit the mainstream paradigms' categories has led feminist and new social movement scholars to move beyond critique to create new theoretical categories to explain their findings. These new categories challenge resource mobilization and political process' assumptions that the designation of social movement activity only applies to the activities of large-scale organizations that lead to mass mobilizations. These new categories acknowledge that social movement activity exists in everyday life in the aftermath of mass mobilization outside the formal boundaries of classic SMOs. For example, Katzenstein calls protests within the church and the U.S. military "unobtrusive mobilizations." By that she means protest that takes place within institutional walls. Taylor's "abeyance structures" addresses the forms social movement persistence and

continuity can assume between mass mobilizations. Drawing on their research on the links between women in the National Women's Party, an organization founded to fight for women's suffrage, and individual women in NOW, a major liberal feminist organization founded in the 1960s, Rupp and Taylor (1987) and Taylor (1989) see these connections and the organization that evolved as part of an elite-sustained abeyance process. Taylor (1989:761) defines abeyance as a "holding process by which movements sustain themselves in non-receptive political environments and provide continuity from one stage of mobilization to another." Bound together by a shared culture, friendships, and emotions, former feminist activists find a niche for themselves and a base from which to challenge the status quo.

Taylor regards the lesbian community as a contemporary example of "abeyance activities." She and Rupp (1993) believe that lesbian feminists' concerns with identity, culture, and community help the women's movement to persist and survive by promoting feminist values and by encouraging women's independence from male authority and interdependence among women. The two authors' views contrast with those of Echols (1989) and Rosen (2004). Echols and Rosen consider lesbian-inspired "cultural feminism" as signs that the women's movement has lost its radical, confrontational edge. Buechler's (1990: 61) "social movement communities" distinguish between bureaucratic organizations like NOW and the communal and equalitarian organizations that characterize the radical autonomous women's movement. These communities consist of informal networks of politicized participants who advocate for social movement goals outside the boundaries of social

movement organizations. Staggenborg and Lecomte (2009) elaborate the important

role that educational, cultural, and service organizations have in organizing annual

cultural events such as the Gay Pride March, "Take Back the Night" events,

International Women's Day, and Women's History Month, which promote feminist

solidarity by reminding participants about their issues and history. Whitter (1995)

draws on Mannheim's (1952) concept of "political generations" to argue that the

women's movement persists over time through a succession of mini-cohorts

(initiators, organizational founders, joiners, and sustainers), each defined by its own

historically specifically internal organizational needs and external political

opportunities. Meyer and Whittier (1994) argue for women's movement persistence

by developing the concept of "social movement spillover." Spillover of movement

ideas, strategies, and practices occurs when coalitions form or when activists have

multiple organizational memberships. Using the feminists' peace movement

participation as an example, Meyer and Whittier document (1994) that feminist

influence on the peace movement in the movement's stress on anti-leadership, anti-

hierarchical practices, the juxtaposition of military violence against maternal

nurturing. To Tilly's (1999: 258-60) dismay, Whittier (1995) argues that a social

movement should be defined by its organization as well as by its collective identity.[7]

Whittier defines collective identity as individual, informal networks and communities

united by shared values and beliefs, cultural practices, and self-identification as

feminists. She argues that women's movement persisted through its collective identity

even when its organization structure diminishes:

Even as movement veterans withdrew from organized feminism, they continued to weave their politics into their daily lives, challenging undesirable assumptions and prescriptions about women and their position both directly and symbolically. Feminists from this political generation [the '60s] challenge dominant definitions of women in their workplaces through jobs oriented toward social change and in the way they structure their relationships, spend their leisure time, dress and behave, and raise their children. (Whitter 1995:119–120).

I agree.

Research Objectives

My goal is to contribute to the feminist social movement scholarship that documents and analyzes feminist political activity during lulls between mass mobilizations. As previously discussed, research on this topic (Rupp and Taylor 1987; Katzenstein 1988 and 1990; Buechler 1990; Whittier 1995; Staggenborg and Lecomte 2009), like resource mobilization and political process research, focuses on collective, not individual action. Social movement micromobilization researchers (McAdam 1986; Snow, et al. 1986; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; McAdam and Paulsen 1993) call this receptivity "biographic availability," defined as contact with those already engaged, the amount of time they have apart from their responsibilities, and the absence of conflicting pressures. However, these scholars do not address the role that institutional arrangements have in making such availability possible. I have long been interested in how an institution's organizational arrangements facilitate and hinder an individual's political consciousness and activism and, by implication, their receptivity to collective political activity (Johnson 1979). I propose to explore Whittier's claims by going beyond micromobilization scholars' concept of

25

"biographical availability" to examine how institutional arrangements at home and at work in everyday life affect my respondents' abilities to translate their beliefs into practice, and in this way, contribute to movement continuity and persistence.

Chapter Organization

In the chapters that follow, I illustrate and analyze these themes and concepts with the voices of my second-wave feminist respondents. In Chapter 1, I define my research problem, my research objective, and review how the social movement literature has addressed the issue of what happens to social movements in the aftermath of mass mobilization. In Chapter 2, I describe my intellectual genealogy, my research design, my analytic and interpretative strategy, and my methodological concerns. I offer thumbnail sketches of the women I interviewed. In Chapter 3, I draw on their accounts to describe how their oppositional gender consciousness developed and how my respondents became "mobilized" into the women's movement in the late 1960s. I introduce the theme of "not fitting" as my respondents' reactions to the discrepancy between their individual talents, increasing opportunities for higher education and paid employment and the metanarrative about "women's place." I analyze my respondents' narrative through the lens of the dilemmas my respondents report as they translate their beliefs into practice. I trace the steps of their growing oppositional gender awareness while participating in '60s movements. I conclude by identifying the key elements of oppositional gender consciousness, showing how these beliefs vary, when they do, according to occupational choices and household arrangements. The metanarrative about "women's place" shaping their experiences as

young girls growing up in the '50s provides a foil for these feminists' opposition to the status quo.

In Chapter 4, I present my second set of findings, regarding former feminist activists' efforts to translate their beliefs into oppositional gender practices in their workplaces. I label their occupations as academic (professors, lecturers, program directors), independent professionals (lawyers, artists, contractors) and staff (clerks, secretaries, receptionists, and office managers) I divide the academics and professionals respectively into two groups by their organizational context—bureaucratic or independent, community-based), university staff, and movement/day jobs. I outline the second-wave feminist oppositional gender consciousness, motivations, beliefs, and practices underlying these strategies. I compare the differences among my respondents according to their occupational choices, offer my interpretation of the factors affecting their variations, and indicate the trade-offs and consequences of their decisions.

In Chapter 5, I turn my attention to how my respondents translated their beliefs about family/household arrangements—what it meant to be attractive to potential partners, how they envisioned their ideal mate, how they preserved their independence and autonomy, how they dealt with their sexuality, what marriage or commitment meant to them, and how they created a shared division of household labor. I describe how these beliefs get translated into oppositional gender practices. I compare the differences among them according to their sexual preferences and

different family arrangements and offer my interpretation of the factors affecting their variations.

In Chapter 6, my concluding chapter, I return to my original research questions: "When a social movement is no longer a mass movement and publicly visible, what do former feminist activists think and do in their everyday lives? In what way do their actions contribute to social movement persistence and continuity?" Drawing on 17 case studies based on interviews with former activists, I summarize the factors cited in Chapters 4 and 5 that shape my respondents' oppositional gender practice, and I suggest that during lulls between mass mobilizations, the women I interviewed created social movement continuity through their individual acts of persistence and through oppositional gender practices. I argue that their actions serve as interim practices that create "sentiment pools" of individuals receptive to the women's movement's message and in this way constitute bridges between one protest cycle and the next. I end by discussing the ways in which I believe my dissertation contributes to social movement scholarship and I suggest future research possibilities.

CHAPTER 2. METHODS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

My project is a qualitative case study based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews of 17 "highly committed" San Franciscso Bay Area feminist activists chosen because of their sexual preferences and their post-movement career choices to work in predominantly male-dominated fields in bureaucratic or in independent settings, in female-segregated occupations, or to remain in movement positions earning their livings with day jobs. In this chapter, I explain my methodological and study design choices by describing my intellectual genealogy, my research parameters, my data analysis and interpretive strategy, and, finally, my methodological concerns.

My research interest is both autobiographical and theoretical. As a veteran second-wave feminist and lifelong feminist activists, I found that my interest in the '60s was piqued when discussions of New Left activism began to appear in the late '70s and '80s (Cluster 1979; Gitlin 1987; Hayden 1988; McAdam 1988; Whalen and Flacks 1989). As noted in the previous chapter, these writings neglected the role of the '60s women's movement (Breines 1988; Martinez 1989). I became curious to find out how lives like mine had turned out.

Intellectual Genealogy

I found a home in the social movement literature. Not surprisingly, I discovered kindred spirits. Like me, many of the scholars had been activists during the '60s. I identified with the social movement field's research questions, which, I realized, theorized the same questions I used to ask as an organizer: What are the

conditions that lead to a social movement's emergence? What are the appropriate arenas for struggle, the best targets for action, and the effective strategies and tactics to achieve a movement's objectives? How do social movements effect societal change?

However, despite my affinity with the field's research questions, I realized that the field's focus on collective action would not be amenable to my interest in how institutional arrangements in everyday life influenced my respondents' strategies to translate their beliefs into practice. My research interest favored a method based on listening to my respondents' narratives and using their subjective responses to examine the cultural beliefs, the social relations, and the institutional arrangements that facilitated and/or hindered my respondents' translation process. My decision to organize my research design in this way represents my effort to connect the dots between the structuralist resource mobilization and constructivist feminist and new social movement theories discussed in the previous chapter. Over the last several decades, adherents of these different theories have debated the role and the relative importance of structure and rationality as opposed to emotions and culture in framing a movement's demands, its message, its trajectory, and its outcome. In recent years, these two camps have reached a detente, each acknowledging the contributions of the other (McAdam 1982, 2004; Gamson 1992; Tarrow 2004).[9] My objective is to contribute to this new direction by bringing together what these social movement theorists have previously analytically separated—history, social structure, individual subjectivity, agency, identity, culture, and emotions (Johnston 2014). Institutional

arrangements embody cultural norms and are the immediate, everyday way individuals experience culture and structures. Examining the impact of culture and institutional arrangements in everyday life offers, I believe, a good entry point to make connections between structuralist and constructivist approaches. Mills (1959), Personal Narratives Group (1989), Reinarman (1987), Laslett 1999; Plummer (2001), and Maynes, Pierce, and Laslett (2008) provide guidelines about how to move in this direction.[10]

My Research Design

Face-to-face interactions occur within institutional arrangements. My research design takes as its starting point a basic assumption of new social movement theory as characterized by Darnovsky, Epstein and Flacks (1995: xiv) that "large-scale social change is accomplished in face-to-face interaction at the level of personal identity and consciousness, in the household and neighborhood, whether or not such change is enunciated in public policy and macro-level power relations." Their assumption led me to grounded theory and methods.

Grounded theory was pioneered by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in the traditions of Mead (1934), Cooley (1922), and Blumer (1966, 1969), and developed further by Glaser and Strauss's adherents (Goffman 1974; Denzin 1989; Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Lofland and Lofland 1995; Charmaz 2006). Grounded theory developed as a critique of the then dominant structural-functionalist theory and methods (Parsons 1951). Glaser and Strauss criticized the structural-functionalists for what they claimed was a view of the empirical world as a laboratory for scholars to verify deductively

reasoned theoretical hypotheses in order to generate universally applicable "grand theory."11 Arguing that structural-functional theories rarely fit the empirical world, Glaser and Straus advocated an incremental, theory-building process based on inductive reasoning growing out of insights gained from their study participants' narratives and their own participant observations. This incremental back-and-forth process begins with research questions and what Charmaz (2006:17) labels "concepts as *points of departure* [italics in the original]." These questions and concepts lead to successive theoretical samplings to follow up on hunches and leads. The method of "constant comparisons," exploring the similarities and differences in respondents' narratives, reassesses the validity of initial ideas—refining, elaborating, or discarding them in favor of new ideas that have emerged. Ideally, grounded theory research continues until theoretical sampling is saturated (repetition occurs and no new patterns emerge).

My research also draws on feminist research methods. Many of the values underlying grounded theory's use of in-depth, semi-structured interviewing correspond to those that feminist methodologists espouse (Harding, 1987; Reissman 1987; DeVault 1990, 1996, 1999; Reinharz 1992; Fine 1994). Qualitative and feminist researchers stress the importance of bringing the voices of those silenced by the dominant order to the fore, conducting research that "does no harm," that contributes to the well-being of those in the study, and that minimizes the effects of educational, class, or cultural inequalities between researcher and study participants. Acting "with" rather than "on," being open, and acknowledging that research is not

value-free are important values of qualitative and feminist research. The method is not without its problems (see section on methodological concerns).

I drew my pool of potential respondents from the University of California's Bancroft Library's Social Protest Collection, from biographical entries in Barbara Love's *Feminists Who Changed America: 1963–1975* (2006), from my personal activist records, and from contacts I met at two events—a San Francisco book release party for *Feminists Who Changed America* and an opening for a Berkeley art gallery photo exhibit on the '60s. These sources provided me with considerable demographic information about these women. I adopted as my own the time frame (1967–1975) most often cited by feminist scholars as the beginning and ending of the '60s mass women's movement (Echols 1989; Rosen 2000; Evans 2003).To chart trends in the mass media coverage of the second-wave feminist movement, I maintained an archive of clippings and articles between 1990 and 2016 from the *NewYork Times,* the *San Francisco Chronicle,* and *Time* magazine.

I used the criteria of "highly committed," as well as time period, length of San Francisco Bay Area residence, and the type, duration, and intensity of involvement, to narrow this pool of about 70 individuals to a smaller group of about 30 potential respondents. To achieve diversity in the range of respondents, I further narrowed this pool to 17 by eliminating individuals whose demographic characteristics duplicated others. To determine if a potential respondent met my focus on the San Francisco Bay Area eligibility "highly committed" criteria, I required that respondents had lived in the Bay Area three to five years, been involved in the women's movement for at least

two years, and engaged in three to five of a list of nine activities ranked from low to high intensity during the '67–'75 time period.12 My focus on "highly committed" former feminist activists was based on the assumption that feminist beliefs and practices would be strongest among members of this group.

I chose a group of five activists who represented the range of occupations and sexual preferences I was interested in and sent each an email about my project to explore their interest in being interviewed. My email included my eligibility criteria for participation for their review. After receiving a positive expression of interest, I followed up with an extended phone call to determine if they did meet my "highly committed" criteria. I wanted to gain additional demographic information, and, if my potential respondents met all my criteria, to arrange an interview. My women's movement experience, my reading of feminist scholarship on differences among women according to their occupational choices and sexual preferences, and my interest in how institutional arrangements affected feminists' political consciousness and activism made me think that these two demographic features would be important in my analysis (Rich 1986; Acker 1990, 1992). Adhering to grounded theory's advocacy for theoretical sampling, my objective was to get together a diverse group initially, and then to select feminist activists to interview that would follow up and deepen my initial insights. I identified myself as a second-wave feminist. This identification, I believe, inspired trust. No one refused to be interviewed.

My interview schedule benefited from the work of feminist standpoint theorists (Hartsock 1983; Harding 1987, 1993; Henessey 1993; Fine 1994). Feminist

standpoint theory posits that sociological inquiry must begin with the understanding

that class, racial, and gender locations underlie and influence an individual's values,

beliefs, actions and interactions. Applying this perspective, it follows that a

researcher's interview questions and a study participant's responses should be

contextualized by taking into account how the researcher's and the respondent's

respective backgrounds influence a researcher's questions, the respondent's answers,

and the researcher's conclusions. I made sure that my interview schedule included

questions about my respondent's backgrounds. My interview schedule was divided

into sections that addressed my respondents' socialization as young girls, their '60s

activist histories, their beliefs about marriage, family, and career, and their strategies

for translating those beliefs into practice in the workplace and in the household,

including their efforts to balance their work with their family responsibilities. I

piloted my interview schedule, using two different formats, with a few feminist

friends, who were not part of the interview pool (Payne 1951). The first format

included sections organized chronologically into two time periods—the '60s and '75

to the present. The second was topical instead of chronological. Within each topic, I

asked about translating feminist beliefs into practices in the '60s and from '75 to the

present. The second format proved less confusing and more effective because it

avoided jumping between topics and time periods. I brought pictures to jog my

respondents' memories about '60s feminists doing carpentry, fixing cars, using

mirrors and speculums to learn about their bodies, holding picket signs, and marching

in demonstrations.

The table on the following page provides a numerical portrait of my 17 respondents. Thumbnail sketches of my respondents' backgrounds follow. Many of my respondents had recently retired at the time of my interviews. These sketches detail my respondents' pre-retirement lives. See Chapter 6 for my respondents' post-retirement activism.

Table 1: Respondent Demographic Characteristics

| | Predominantly Male Professions | | Female-Segregated Occupations | Movement/Day Jobs |
	Bureaucratic Setting	Independent Professional		
Names:	Christina, Irene, Rachel, Carol, Olivia	Barbara, Diane, Sarah, Elizabeth	Meredith, Jane, Rebecca, Mary, Molly	Susan, Lynn, Trudy
Occupations:	3: Professors 1: Archivist 1: University Administrator	1: Artist 1: Lawyer 1: Contractor/ Carpenter 1: Lecturer/ Consultant	2: Clerical Workers 2: K–12 Teachers 1: Admin. Asst.	2: Artists 1: Full-time Activist
Age Range(s):	5: 58-69	4: 58-69	4: 58-69 1: 81	3: 58-69
Education:	3: PhDs 2: MAs	1: PhD 1: JD 1: MA 1: BA	2: BAs + Teaching Credential 3: BAs	1: PhD 2: BAs
Socio-economic Class* of Family Origin:	1: Middle 3: Working 1: Upper-Middle	2: Middle 1: Working 1: Upper	2: Middle 3: Working	2: Middle 1: Upper
Marital/ Commitment Status, Sexual Preference, Household Arrangement:	1: Cohabiting heterosexual couples, communal 2: Married heterosexual couples 1: Cohabiting lesbian couple 1: Single bisexual	1: Cohabiting heterosexual couple 1: Single lesbian 1: Single bisexual, communal 1: Single heterosexual	1: Married heterosexual, communal 1: Single heterosexual, with roommates 2: Married heterosexual, nuclear families 1: Married heterosexual couple	1: Married heterosexual couple 1: Single lesbian 1: Single bisexual
Race:	5: Caucasian	4: Caucasian	5: Caucasian	3: Caucasian

*According to respondents' self-description

Christina is a full professor of biochemistry, a predominantly male field, at an urban university where she has worked without interruption for the past 30 years. Christina grew up in a small Midwestern town as one of three daughters. Her background is middle class. Her father was a college professor in the sciences. Her mother was a stay-at-home mom. Educated at a Midwestern liberal arts college, she received her doctorate in the '70s from a University of California campus. Christina is heterosexual. For the past 28 years, she has lived in a non-traditional, long-term relationship in a communal house with a younger community organizer whom she recently decided to marry. She has three grown children.

Irene is a full professor of sociology at a California State University campus. She was born in a rural area in the Midwest into a working-class family that was close to, but not part of the Communist Party. Her parents divorced when she was young. Her father was an alcoholic. Her mother, the family's sole support, was a salesclerk. Irene came to academia late, after a variety of jobs, including modeling and small business. Married three times and the mother of one child, Irene experimented with communal living, but now lives alone with her current husband. Irene chose a path that led her into predominantly male field in the social sciences.

Diane was educated on the East Coast through college and went to California to get a law degree at a University of California campus. She has worked as an employment and civil rights attorney in small, underfunded movement law collectives, in legal aid offices, and as a legal counsel and business agent in labor unions. She belongs to a national left-wing lawyers' organization. Born and raised in

New York. Diane's background is working class. Her father was an inconsistent breadwinner. Her mother worked out of necessity to support their family. After many years in movement law collectives and work as a union representative, Diane decided to no longer work in group settings and went out on her own to start a solo employment law practice. A lesbian and child-free, she is involved as an "auntie" with a former lover's child. Diane has spent her most of her adult life in mixed male and female movement collectives. She now lives by herself with her dog in a former communal house she now owns.

Carol has a PhD in history and has worked for 25 years at a major university as the director of an externally funded research project. Born in New York, she was raised by her mother and grandparents after her father's death. Money was tight. Her background is working class. Educated in the Midwest, she received her PhD at a University of California campus. Carol is married with two children, one grown, the other in college. She lives in a house with her husband, a lawyer, and uses the downstairs apartment as a rental for income. Carol's extramurally funded project is linked to the university through the sponsorship of a tenured faculty member. While the university provides administrative support, her project operates outside the university's departmental structure. Unlike Christina, whose life partner had a flexible, supportive role, she married a high-powered professional whose work context and aspirations ran counter to hers.

Elizabeth is a native San Franciscan with middle-class family roots in Kentucky. With a PhD in sociology, Elizabeth is an independent professional who has

worked as itinerant lecturer at multiple San Francisco Bay Area institutions and as a consultant in human and health services. She has also written several books, made films, climbed mountains, and run marathons. Heterosexual, ever-single, and child-free, Elizabeth lives in a rented flat in Bay Area. She relies on an international network of friends and neighbors for friendship and support.

Rachel is a part-time college and community college teacher and longtime member of an independent business collective. Rachel grew up in a working-class but college-educated household in the Midwest. Her father was a steel mill worker who rose to management. Her mother was a part-time school teacher. Rachel began a PhD program, but left before doing her dissertation to join the student, antiwar, and women's movements. Initially heterosexual, Rachel came out as a lesbian and decided she would live her life within the lesbian community. Child-free herself, Rachel helped to raise the child of her first lover from infancy to adulthood while living in a monogamous relationship with another woman.

Olivia is a university administrator who began her career with her own small, women-owned movement-oriented printing business. She learned to be a printer at a local community college, earned an MA degree in industrial design to become a professor in a community college printing department, and then advanced to become a department chair and finally a university administrator. Olivia is the child of an upper-middle-class doctor father and a social worker mother. She was born in New York and educated in a private school followed by college in the Midwest. Olivia married once and had a child. Divorced, she has been in several sequential,

heterosexual long-term relationships. Olivia considers herself bisexual. She is part of an alternative spiritual community that runs a soup kitchen.

Mary recently retired after a career as a third-grade elementary school teacher in a Bay Area public school. She grew up in a wealthy suburb, as one of two daughters in a liberal, Democratic, and Jewish family. Her father was a lawyer and her mother held a clerical job to pay for Mary's school tuition and save money for her daughter's college tuition. Educated at a private girls' school for "creative, normal misfits," Mary later got her BA degree and a teaching credential at a University of California campus. She is married to a high school teacher, and since her marriage, she has lived in a nuclear family arrangement with her husband and son.

Molly recently retired as a high school history teacher in an Oakland public school. She grew up in Los Angeles in a left-wing, socialist-leaning but anti-communist, Russian-Jewish family with a professor father and a stay-at-home mother. Educated in Los Angeles public schools, Molly went to a University of California campus for her undergraduate degree and teaching credential. Although primarily a classroom teacher, Molly expanded her reach by becoming a school administrator/consultant involved in the development of district-wide, progressive high school history curriculum projects. Heterosexual and married in her 20s to her "almost first boyfriend," Molly participated in early commune/collective experiments. Molly and her husband remained committed to communal living and shared child-rearing with another couple for more than 30 years in the context of an extended

41

network of relatives, including two siblings who live within walking distance. With their children grown, she and her husband now live alone in their big house.

Jane once was a housewife living in the suburbs in an abusive marriage with two children. Once divorced, she never married again. Jane left her housewife life in an East Coast college town and found her place in the '60s Berkeley counterculture. Born in the Midwest, but raised in a female working-class household in New York, Jane got her BA degree in the humanities and found work in the kind of creative, progressive jobs that flourished in the '60s and are now nearly nonexistent. She worked in the alternative school movement, in the media, and later as an administrator/department manager in a university setting. A liberal feminist active in community politics, Jane identifies with spiritual radical feminism. She is heterosexual, divorced, and single.

Meredith has been a clerical worker for 40 years at a major research university, moving laterally from one position to another and becoming an organizer and a leader of an independent union of non-academic staff. Born in a small town in Northern California, Meredith grew up in the East Bay, attending public schools and received her BA degree at a University of California campus with a major in American history and a focus on labor history. Meredith came from a working-class, Communist Party family. She identifies with trade union issues and within that context, women's economic and civil rights issues. Married to a working-class man for 40 years, she lives with him in a large Victorian as part of an intergenerational

family that includes her elderly mother-in-law, her daughter, son-in-law, and grandchildren.

Rebecca has worked as a clerical at a major research university This position gave her a springboard for her political life as an organizer of an independent women clerical workers union. Rebecca was born in New York into a working-class Communist family with parents who divorced when she was young and was educated in the East and received her BA degree from a University of California campus. Marrying late, Rebecca lived with a man ten years younger than herself with one child in a nuclear family arrangement.

Sarah originally trained as a city planner. She left the professional world after 15 years to strike out on her own as an independent contractor/carpenter with her own small residential remodeling business. Sarah was born and raised in the Chicago area in a liberal, Jewish, free-thinking family. Her father was a professional chemist. Her mother worked part-time. Sarah attended college in the Midwest and attended a University of California campus to obtain her urban planning MA degree. She later took classes in carpentry at local community colleges while apprenticing herself to local tradesman to acquire the carpentry, electrical, and plumbing skills she needed to establish her business. She is bisexual and child-free. She committed herself to living communally with other single women and to being an "auntie" to others' children.

Trudy is a feminist activist, earning her living as a part-time administrative assistant in a research university. She comes from a middle-class, New England, Episcopalian family. Her father was a businessman. Her mother was a housewife.

Educated in a small Midwestern liberal arts private college where she received her BA degree and went South while a student to become part of the civil rights "Freedom Summer" movement. This experience marked her lifelong commitment to feminism and to racial justice. Her first marriage ended in divorce because her husband wanted an "open marriage." During this open marriage period, Trudy experimented with lesbian relationships, but considers herself heterosexual. In her public life, Trudy persisted in her movement activism, seeing her "day job" as supporting her political activism. Divorced from her first husband, she now lives with her second husband in a nuclear family arrangement.

Susan is a full-time movement activist with inherited family wealth that provided her with living expenses and funds for her movement projects. She was born in the Midwest into an old established family with colonial roots. Her father is a successful businessman and her mother a socialite. Educated in a private girls' school that encouraged independence and at a Seven Sisters college. Susan never married and remained a child-free bisexual. She has been in poor health for years and lives alone in a single-family home that is also her office. She has paid caregivers and research assistants to take care of her health and help her with her projects.

Barbara is a professional sculptor and painter, living independently but modestly on a combination of money earned from her artwork and from income derived from family wealth accumulated over several generations. She was born and raised in the Midwest and educated in Swiss boarding schools and attended at an East Coast art college to receive her fine arts BA degree. Barbara's family was upper class

with WASP, originally East Coast origins. Her mother was a socialite and volunteer. Her father was a Republican businessman. Barbara was married once, had a lesbian relationship for a decade, and for the past 20 years has been living in a combined live/work space as part of a cohabiting, heterosexual, child-free couple.

Lynn defines herself as a "full-time, progressive, cultural worker/activist" for the lesbian feminist movement. Born in the Midwest, Lynn was raised in the South by a father who was an engineer and her stay-at-home mother. She participated in the civil rights movement. Her life centered around the Unitarian Church. Her emerging lesbian identity led her to the women's movement when she moved to San Francisco. Although Lynn has a PhD, she did not use her degree to obtain employment. Enabled by a small but ongoing inheritance, occasional art grants, housecleaning jobs, and part-time clerical work, Lynn has dedicated her life to being a chronicler of the San Francisco Bay Area lesbian feminist movement. Lynn also pioneered lesbian feminist parenting by having two children through donor insemination.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

My first analytical task was to review my 17 cases to identify recurrent themes in my respondents' narratives about their experiences, emotions, and reflections. I grouped these themes into four categories: structural factors affecting my respondents' capacities to develop oppositional gender consciousness, steps in developing an oppositional gender consciousness, oppositional gender workplace and domestic practices, and outcomes. I used oppositional gender practices in two ways—

first as a general category and then as a label for a specific workplace and a specific

domestic practice (Chapters 3, 4, and 5).

Clear differences among my respondents emerged according to their

occupational choices in the ways they responded to my questions about how they

translated their beliefs into practice at work. By contrast, I saw a sameness in

heterosexual women's responses to questions about family life despite the fact they

held different jobs. I also noted differences between heterosexual and lesbian

feminists in their responses to my questions about the household division of labor and

representation of self via dress and appearance.

To explore these differences more deeply, I generated comparison groups

based on my respondents' post-movement occupational choices and sexual

preferences. The occupations of the highly committed feminists fell into three broad

categories: predominantly male professions (professor, lawyer, artist,

consultant/filmmaker/author, contractor/carpenter, printer), female-segregated jobs

(clerk, secretary, administrator, K–12 schoolteacher), and what I came to call

movement/day jobs. Movement/day jobs allowed my respondents to have part-time

jobs that required little emotional investment and time and gave them the needed

freedom to devote themselves to their first passion—movement work. To capture

what I saw as the impact of different institutional arrangements of my respondents in

predominantly male occupations, I further divided my respondents in predominately

male occupations into two subgroups—those who worked in large bureaucratic

settings and those who worked in the community as independent professionals on
their own or in small organizations.

My focus on the San Francisco Bay Area proved to be well suited to my goal
of examining how these feminists translated their beliefs into practice at their
workplaces. The area is home to two University of California and two California
State University campuses, both major regional employers. Consequently, it was easy
to find second-wave feminists who worked in the same overarching bureaucratic
structure, but in different institutional arrangements, depending upon their choices to
work in predominantly male occupations as faculty or lecturers or in female-
segregated positions as clerical and administrative workers. I therefore had the ability
to consider the overall structure as a constant and to make comparisons between these
second-wave feminists' abilities to translate their beliefs in practice under different
conditions.

The decision to do a case study of second-wave feminist activists in the San
Francisco Bay Area allowed me to observe the counterculture's influence on the
women's movement. This influence was stronger on the West Coast than on the East
Coast (Barbara Epstein, personal communication 2017). The West Coast's
counterculture encouraged personal transformation and lifestyle experiments in
communal living. Communal living was a way to create families based on bonds of
affinity rather than biology, to reject the idea that men are the only heads-of-
household, to equalize the gender division of household labor, and to explore the
limits of sexual freedom (Berger 1981). Living communally was an important

experience for all but four of my respondents. To capture my emerging understanding

of my respondents' narratives, I wrote memos about my developing categories

(Charmaz 2006).

As I went through these steps, I thought of the concept of political

opportunities, as developed by political process theorists (Eisenger 1973; Meyer and

Minkoff 2004). I decided to call the differences between the responses of feminists to

different institutional arrangements "institutional structures and cultures of

opportunities and constraints." My readings and my career in higher education gave

me knowledge and firsthand familiarity with university structures, academic and staff

personnel policies, values, and cultures (Friedson 1970; Clark 1983; Caplow and

McGee 2001; Washburn 2005).

Emerging Concepts

Three concepts—institutional structures of opportunities and constraints

(abbreviated as institutional arrangements), feminist dilemmas, and oppositional

gender practices—emerged from my respondents' narratives. These concepts gave me

a way to synthesize and interpret my findings.

Institutional structures of opportunities and constraints (abbreviated as

institutional arrangements): Different occupations and different sexual preferences

lead to different structures of workplace and domestic opportunities and constraints

(Meyer and Minkoff 2004). As reported in the following chapters, these differences

affected my respondents' available options to translate their beliefs into practice. In

the workplace, the institutional structures of opportunities and constraints include the

amount of autonomy, discretion, flexibility, privileges, benefits and status an

occupation affords, the compatibility of the position's job duties with feminist goals,

and the organizational context in which work occurs. In the household, the domestic

structures of opportunities and constraints include market dynamics affecting

housing, the availability of financial resources and social support, the working hours

and requirements affecting a partner's time and energy, and the employment policies

affecting work and family balance.

Feminist dilemmas: My respondents reported the personal dilemmas they

encountered as they transitioned from the movement into the mainstream and took up

the challenges of entering the workforce and creating a household and family. At

work, taking these steps meant facing the institutional barriers and opportunities and

addressing the extent to which they could or would challenge bureaucratic

hierarchies, fight for equality, and balance their work responsibilities with their

family's needs. At home, confronting these dilemmas meant challenging their own

and their partners' expectations regarding their roles as wives and mothers, and

asking for a shared division of household labor as well as the right to work outside the

home.

Oppositional gender practices: I gave the name "oppositional gender

practices" to my respondents' descriptions of the actions they took to resolve the

dilemmas they encountered as they addressed the opportunities and the constraints

their workplace and domestic institutional arrangements imposed. These practices

existed on a continuum of resistance to compliance. I owe my use of this concept (modified to specify "gender") to Mansbridge and Morris (2001).13

Methodological Concerns

My decision to do a case study, to use in-depth, semi-structured interviews for gathering data, and to follow the grounded theory approach for interpreting my findings made me grapple with the limitations of case studies and the methodological and ethical questions that feminist scholars, in particular, raise about the importance of values, the role of subjectivity and power relations between researcher and subject (Harding 1987; DeVault 1990, 1996, 1999; Fonow and Cook 1991; Gluck and Patai 1991:11–26, 64–75, 111–119; Fine 1994; Wolf, 1996; Kirsch 1999; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2007:1–21, 52–81, 293–325).

Because my research project is a case study of a small number of San Francisco Bay Area former second-wave feminist activists, my findings and conclusions are limited to these women's experiences and cannot be assumed to be generalized to the national U.S. women's movement. This caveat particularly applies to Chapter 5. My respondents are white and come from working-class, middle-class, and upper-class backgrounds. Their views about the ideal mate, marriage, and family reflect the assumptions and values of their class and racial backgrounds. My observations do not consider the racial and ethnic differences among women of color about how they internalized the doctrine of separate spheres (Hull, Bell-Scott, and Smith 1982; Moraga and Anzaldúa, 1983; Collins 1986, 1990, 1998; Spelman 1988; McIntosh 1988; Davidoff 1995; Combahee River Collective 1999; Zinn and Dill

2003).14 Additionally, my respondents' experiences are West Coast–centric. As mentioned earlier, the West Coast '60s experience was more countercultural than in other parts of the country. The second-wave feminists' communal living experiments are specific to the San Francisco Bay Area and cannot be assumed to be replicated elsewhere.

I am mindful of Evans' (2003) warnings about the dangers of distortion and oversight, such as substituting my own history for that of others or failing to ask questions that would challenge my assumptions. Her concerns speak to feminist methodologist Kirsch's (1999) writings about the place of values in research, about a researcher's potential bias, and about the potential power differentials of class and education between researcher and respondent as well as the respondent's greater vulnerability because she speaks while the researcher asks questions, listens, and remains largely silent. My background as a middle-class and college-educated woman was similar to the majority of women I interviewed. My past experiences include friendships and collegial relationships with women from upper, upper-middle, and working-class backgrounds. This similarity mitigated the class and educational power differentials that can affect the researcher/respondent relationship.

My history as a feminist activist was far more important. It bred familiarity and trust. However, this familiarity was double-sided. On the one hand, I had no problem with access. My respondents were open and willing to spend considerable time with me. It was easy for me to understand my respondents' experiences and to grasp the meaning of the in vivo codes they used such as "the click," "men as the

enemy," "woman-identified," "piggish behavior," and "macho." On the other hand, I occasionally had difficulty directing the conversation to the topics I hoped to cover in the available time. One respondent said to me, "Wait a minute, I am not finished!" Sometimes, that familiarity made it hard for me to hold back and resist my impulse to say, "That happened to me, too!" I resolved this problem by requesting subsequent interviews which varied from two to nine hours. To avoid the mistake of projecting my experiences and assumptions onto my respondents, I maintained a "My Story" file to sort out the similarities and differences between my experiences and theirs.

I turn now in the next two chapters to telling the stories of my respondents' process of developing oppositional gender consciousness and to their efforts in the workplace and in the home to translate their feminist beliefs into oppositional gender practices.

CHAPTER 3. DEVELOPMENT OF OPPOSITIONAL GENDER CONSCIOUSNESS

My second-wave feminist activists came of age in the historical moment of the '60s when the relationship between the public and private spheres was in a process of a tectonic-like shift.15 Birth control pills gave women reproductive control and independence. Doors of higher education had opened. Expansion of the financial and service sectors offered women employment. Yet newspapers' classified employment ads still read, "Help Wanted. Women Need Not Apply." Postwar affluence promised the growing middle class the joys of suburban life (Skolnick and Skolnick 1992; Breines 1992; Coontz 2000). The memory of Rosie the Riveter, the symbol of women's World War II involvement in the male work world, however, cast a shadow on the glow of the idealized '50s vision of a happy nuclear family with the wife at home, alone with children.

The possibility of reproductive control, education, financial independence, and individual achievement ran counter to my respondents' parental pressures to remain true to women's traditional path. They faced a yawning gap between their talents, their skills, their interests and their own changing expectations on the one hand, and the reality of the still lingering metanarrative about "women's place" on the other. This metanarrative prescribed a set of political, economic, cultural, institutional, and psychological ideologies about the meaning of "womanhood," and the appropriate behavioral and institutional practices that functioned to circumscribe their possibilities. (Morgan 1970; Tanner 1970; Breines 1992; Baxandall and Gordon 2000). The civil rights, the student, and the antiwar movements provided the context

for the second-wave feminist movement and energized its collective actions. As my

respondents' narratives will show, their efforts to translate their feminist beliefs into

practice in their everyday lives represented a continuation of the women's

movement's goals. In this chapter, I introduce the theme of "not fitting" into

"women's place." Using my respondents' narratives, I outline the underlying

conditions that supported their participation in the women's movement. I trace the

steps of my respondents' growing oppositional gender awareness amid the '60s social

movements, and conclude by identifying the key elements of their oppositional

gender consciousness and practices that supported their efforts.

Not Fitting

What qualities and experiences distinguished my feminist respondents as

young women from other women in the general population? Framed in the language

of social movement scholarship, what are the micro-level factors that account for an

individual's differential availability to participate in social movements? (Snow,

Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980). The theme of "not fitting" was a recurrent thread

running through all my respondents' interviews. I interpret my respondents'

expressions about "not fitting" as their reactions to the shifting ground that underlay

their experiences. The feminist movement's message of women's right to a career

outside the home, to be economically self-sufficient and independent, and to have

creative and sexual expression attracted my respondents to the movement and gave

them feelings of empowerment and belonging.

I attribute my respondents' sense of "not fitting" in part to their distinctive personal qualities—independence, spiritedness, originality, and nonconformity. Elizabeth, a PhD, freelance writer, consultant, and filmmaker, told me, "I am a challenger. I think outside the box and resist convergent thinking. I am the architect of my life. I am the architect of every single day." Christina, a life scientist: "I had a feisty streak that fit with what the women's movement wanted." Molly, a public high school teacher: "I was just stubborn. I would refuse when someone asked me to do something I thought I shouldn't or didn't want to do. That is just the way I am." Irene, a college professor: "I was very independent. It never occurred to me to organize my life around a man." Lynn, a lifelong lesbian activist: "My attitude is, you can't stop me!" Jane, a university office manager: "I always marched to my own drummer. I didn't fit, but it didn't bother me."

My respondents' interests and skills contrasted with those of their playmates and later their female classmates. Their interests and skills did not fit with expectations about what girls should like to do. Jane told me, "I never played with dolls. When I was a kid, I liked to be outside a lot and climb on the garage. I wasn't wild. I wasn't a daredevil. I just didn't have the same priorities as other women." Olivia, a printer by trade, also did not like dolls. "I played with jigsaw puzzles. I loved working with my hands and the smell of a printed text." Christina said, "I wanted to know what was in my father's books. I loved learning and I was good at it." Sarah, a carpenter/contractor, said, "Looking back, I was always interested in carpentry since I was a child. I did construction all the way through my life." Diane, a

55

lawyer, said it best. "I was always like different. I wanted to do things you weren't supposed to do."

Totalist attitudes—the willingness to sacrifice personal needs for the movement's collective good—characterized my respondents' women's movement participation and made them more willing to take risks and to identify with other women (Whalen and Flacks 1989:246–252). Lynn, who was a civil rights activist, was committed and idealistic. "We had a sense of our oppression. We had a sense of history. We had a sense of wanting to make major change in the world." Trudy, then a civil rights and peace activist, also came from a religious, churchgoing family. She became a leader in the radical autonomous women's movement. A fellow peace activist confronted her and asked, "Do you want to live in a world where the rich survive, or do you want a world where everyone survives?" His challenge was her turning point. From then on, she resolved to act on the basis of interests larger than her own. "I went to Mississippi. I thought it was God's will." Initially, the women's movement and then the lesbian movement defined Lynn's life. She became a photographer of the lesbian movement and pioneered lesbian parenting. "I was never worried. There's been a movement waiting for me at every time that I had to make a decision of what to do next." Susan dedicated her life to advocating for the legislative recognition of marital rape. She described a formative childhood experience: "When I was 12 years old, I saw this picture in our local museum entitled *The Last Slave Auction*. I vowed then that I would devote my life to ending slavery. I saw marriage as slavery. I don't do that."

Almost all my respondents were aware of their mothers' dissatisfactions with the constraints that the traditional female responsibilities had imposed. This awareness focused their energies and made them receptive to the feminist critique of the traditional female role's constraints. Barbara's and Mary's comments are representative. Barbara, a visual artist and a sculptor, told me, "My mother was an alcoholic and a pack-of-Luckys-a-day kind of person. She was also brilliant. She had to hide her writing. If anyone knew where she grew up that she was earning money, it would make her husband look bad." Mary, who became a schoolteacher, explained the thinking behind her choice to not become a stay-at-home wife and mother:

> There was a part of me that knew I had saved myself from somehow becoming a woman like my mother who was dependent on a man for his paycheck and that produced a great deal of pain. There was a part of me that knew I wasn't that. I had a job. I could make a livin*g*.

Enabling Conditions: Affluent Times, Synergy of Time and Place, and Inherited Wealth

Affluent times encouraged activists' rising expectations, making it possible for my respondents to take risks (Whalen and Flacks 1989). The U.S. economy was expanding in the '60s. Jobs were plentiful for educated whites. Essentials were inexpensive. It was possible to live cheaply and give time and energy to movement activities. My respondents interested in pursuing graduate degrees to have academic or professional careers could take advantage of state, federal, and philanthropic investments in higher education to obtain graduate funding. Christina explained how the availability of funding, encouragement from faculty, and the political climate gave her courage to break barriers:

57

I think I was lucky in the timing of things because at the same time I was getting these fellowships and acceptances to graduate school, I was also getting involved in the antiwar movement and then the women's movement so that if it all hadn't come together when it did for me, I probably wouldn't be a scientist.

Lynn, a photographer with a PhD that she never used, benefited from this federal largesse:

My department had applied for some NIH scholarships for their graduate students, not thinking they'd get them, and all of a sudden they had ten scholarships. They had to find some students to take them. But you had to be going for a PhD. So they called me asking if I'd be interested. This scholarship covered all tuition and books, plus support for me. The first years, I didn't even spend all the money they gave me. I mean, it wouldn't sound like a lot of money now, but it was more than enough to live on. So I said, "If I don't complete the PhD, do I have to give the money back?" And they kind of groaned and said, "No." So I took it. So for the next seven years, I'm supported by those grants, and I did finish [my thesis].

What I call "the synergy of time and place" facilitated the recruitment and mobilization of activists in the San Francisco Bay Area in the '60s. By "synergy of time and place," I mean geographic proximity in a critical historical moment. This proximity meant activists and potential recruits were in touch with others who shared their values and exposed them to ideas and events that changed their political consciousness. Rebecca, a UC secretary, remembered:

Protest was in the air. Action was in the streets. Stuff was happening in the South. There was the Vietnam War. You could have all these tables [on UC Berkeley's Sproul Hall Plaza] and all these civil rights and antiwar groups organizing and handing out information. . . . There was a general spirit of resistance. The civil rights and the women's movement were making it possible and imperative to organize the women's movement.

Diane, a lawyer, captured the sense that activists were not just living life, but making history (Flacks 1988):

58

I can describe my law school education by the political movements that were going on at the time. There was "Stop the Draft Week" which was antiwar. The second year was the Ethnic Studies and then People's Park and during that time the women's movement started happening. My last year was the protest around the bombing of Cambodia.

By the mid-'60s, Berkeley had become a magnet pulling young women and men to the West Coast. Events like "People's Park" (the students' appropriation of university property) and "Provo Park" (the Berkeley citizens' appropriation of Berkeley City Hall's green space) literally and figuratively opened up public space. Geographic proximity made organizing mass, public events easier. According to Christina, who had recently arrived in Berkeley for her graduate studies, **"**Everyone went to the Berkeley Co-op bulletin board to find out what was going on." The convergence and synergy of different social movements swirling in one place affirmed and empowered those in its orbit. Over time, my respondents' attachment to the San Francisco Bay Area solidified (Gould 2004). Leaving the Bay Area was not an option for Elizabeth, the writer/ consultant/ filmmaker. She explained:

This Berkeley is me. This is who I am. The idea of taking a job anywhere else is something I would never consider, because this is my home, this is where I am connected, where I network, and where I live. Berkeley wasn't just a university town. It was my life. Living elsewhere wasn't an option.

This synergy allowed a movement subculture to grow, supported by alternative institutions that met activists' needs and served as launch pads for mobilizations. Broadly speaking, two different but overlapping political subcultures emerged. These subcultures differed in their views about how best to make social change. "Hippies" espoused dropping out and creating an alternative culture based on

59

a romantic nineteenth-century vision of the simplicity of agricultural life. They advocated rejecting materialist and consumer values, going back to the land to grow their own food, using marijuana and psychedelic drugs for "pleasure and enlightenment," and engaging in "free love." Those that came to the city claimed Berkeley's Telegraph Avenue and San Francisco's Haight Ashbury as their turf. Some of those that left went to the California hills and built rural communes (Berger 1981).

"Politicos," the other group, advocated confronting "the state" to end the war and to transform the social, economic, and political order through collective action—demonstrations, petitions, marches, and rallies with tactics ranging from peaceful protest, civil disobedience to, in some cases, armed violence. Some advocated "putting socialism on the national agenda." Latin America's Fidel Castro and Che Guevara and China's Mao Zedung were the heroes of many activists in the New Left. Others favored anarchism and libertarianism. Returnees from the civil rights movement in the South allied with and advocated for the Black Panthers, whose national headquarters were on Grove Street, now known as Martin Luther King Jr Way (Gitlin 1987).

Hippies and politicos did more than direct their actions towards creating an alternative music and artistic culture and what they called confronting "the state." They worked separately and together to establish alternative cultural, social, and political institutions, a kind of revolutionary bedrock intended to support and sustain '60s activists and the local community. Institutions like the Berkeley Food Co-op and

the food conspiracies—precursors of the now well-established farmers' markets—flea

markets, Goodwill thrift stores, and consignment shops supplied activists with basic

necessities such as clothing, appliances, and household furniture. These local

businesses made it possible for New Left and feminist activists to live cheaply and

marginally. Alternative feminist institutions and women-owned small businesses

provided medical care, social support, feminist-oriented culture, and media.16 These

organizations did far more than meet activists' immediate needs. Women's political

consciousness grew in these settings. They became incubators for oppositional gender

practices. Aspiring feminist volunteers received training as paraprofessionals and

aides from sympathetic volunteer doctors, lawyers, journalists, and artists, as well as

insights into occupations until then barred to women.

Inherited wealth enabled three of my respondents to realize their commitments

to stay the course in the women's movement. Family money allowed them to fund

their living expenses, jump-start their projects, and accept low-paying jobs that would

not interfere with their loyalty to the movement. For Barbara, daughter of a

businessman and a socialite, this money made it possible for her to not compromise

her ambitions to be an independent, feminist artist:

> My mother gave both my brother and me ten thousand dollars per year in two
> installments—which was as much as you could give without being taxed. That
> was really very kind of her. The most I could ever actually make except for
> the six months that I was at Lucas Films was like fifteen thousand a year.
> That's not enough even in the '80s to live in the Bay Area. The fact that she
> gave me another ten thousand, then I had like twenty-five thousand a year. I
> could live on that if I was really careful. And I am. I have always been, so that
> was really helpful. She basically gave me a grant every year to be who I was.

Similarly, Olivia was able to devote herself to movement activity for several years:

> The year my father died, so did my grandparents. They left me a trust fund. I used it to help me build my [women-owned] print shop, to do my divorce, and to help me buy this house.

There was a downside to inherited wealth. Class differences between my respondents and their feminist sisters created political conflicts that hindered their effectiveness. Olivia admitted:

> I had conflicts with my coworkers at the women's newspaper about what stories to print. It was a class issue. I had an international focus. They were focused on domestic concerns. I wasn't feeling oppressed in my daily life and so I could look outward. Yes, I became a wageworker, but I didn't experience the wageworker mentality because of the resources I had.

However, Olivia and Trudy did use their money to benefit the women's movement. Olivia told me, "I gave a lot of money away. I think I used it very progressively." Trudy helped her lesbian friends to pay their rent. She also gave away several thousands of dollars by pasting hundred-dollar bills on the walls of toilet stalls in a local welfare office!

Inherited wealth also psychologically softened the loss of ascribed social status and the harshness of the barebones existence my respondents had chosen. Living in a small, rented apartment with thrift store furniture, Elizabeth insisted on showing me the precious jewelry she had inherited from her former existence, as if to say, "I am not really the person my circumstances imply." For Lynn, the PhD photographer, memories about her middle-class status shielded her from internalizing and accepting the societal devaluation her acquired lower status as a housecleaner incurred. She wasn't really a housecleaner! To get clients, her advertising flyers

evoked a romantic image of artistic creativity: "Hire a Housecleaner! Support a Starving Artist!" But inside the women's movement, she called herself a "cultural worker" not an "artist" to ensure she identified with the working class and that her appeal to potential clients would not be perceived as elitist (she was not alone in this).

Different Political Paths to the Women's Movement

My respondents' prior involvements, in the Communist Party or in movements such as the civil rights, the antiwar, and the student movement, influenced their beliefs, their choices of a political arena, and their oppositional gender practices as they become involved in the women's movement. (Snow et al. 1986; Polletta 2004).[17]. Four of the women I interviewed had parents who were in the Communist Party. Three became Party members themselves. These women experienced a sense of "not fitting" that was as painful, if not more so, than what my other feminist respondents had felt. As red diaper babies, their childhoods were marred by McCarthyism, blacklisting, and ostracism.

As Irene, now an academic, told me:

We were getting phone calls at our house saying "Commie." My mother was red-baited. Our best friends wouldn't play with us sometimes. I was really angry and out there about this stuff, but my mother was timid. They passed around a petition to get us to move. . . . I was scared. A lot of the family members around me, my mother, my uncle, my grandparents, and relatives and friends that were around when I was a child in Brooklyn were talking about this [McCarthy]. I knew that there were people in prison. I knew about the Rosenbergs. I was afraid my mom was going to be arrested. I liked her, loved her, cared about her, and wanted her around. I had a fourth-grade teacher who asked me one day in front of other kids whether my mother worked for Stalin. I didn't know what she was talking about. I knew it was weird and crazy.

63

In comparison to my respondents who went directly into the women's movement and those who had prior experience in the student and antiwar movements, these respondents were more sensitive to issues of the intersectionality between race, gender, and class. Rebecca, a member of the Communist Party well into her adulthood: "I knew how to connect the dots." They also were more focused than the other respondents on issues of entitlement, fairness, and women's rights in labor unions, whereas the other women focused more on feminist beliefs about transforming the nuclear family, personal development, and creative and sexual expression.

Three of my respondents joined the women's movement directly, without prior experiences in other movements. These respondents had spiritual feminist beliefs, and supported actions aimed at personal advancement, psychological transformation, and alternative institution-building. The remaining respondents who came to the women's movement through their involvement in various New Left movements—including the civil rights, antiwar and student movements—where they absorbed a commitment to anti-capitalist, participatory democracy. They identified as Marxist or socialist feminists. Their New Left beliefs, however, did not translate into adherence to New Left attitudes, behavior, and practices. For these women, their involvement in Students for a Democratic Society served as a foil against which they could articulate their grievances. Much has been written about the New Left's male chauvinism (Breines 1988; Martinez 1989). My respondents' stories about their New Left experiences confirms the critique that women in the New Left were excluded

from decision-making, assigned menial tasks, and treated as instruments for male

sexual pleasure. Olivia described her relationship to movement men this way: "We

had a common anger [against the war and the system], but we didn't have a common

experience.*"* Mary, the schoolteacher, shared this anecdote with me about being part

of a group of SDS women who drafted a leaflet with the headline "Are You

Confused? Do Your Politics Change When Your Boyfriends Change? Come to the

Women's Caucus of SDS!":

> We needed to meet as women because we had a really hard time figuring out
> while all the men argued their various positions, where we stood because our
> politics changed as our boyfriends changed. We realized that there was
> something wrong with this picture. And we met and we essentially decided
> that we talk through the issues ourselves so that when the issues came up, it
> was like pre-learning, pre-teaching, pre-talking so that when we got to the
> meetings we would feel that we could talk. We could raise our hands. We
> could speak, and that our politics were not necessarily tied to whatever male
> we were partnered with at the time. A very funny thing happened at the next
> meeting. It was suggested that the women's caucus be responsible for the
> refreshments at the next SDS meeting. This group lasted for two years as a
> prototype women's consciousness-raising group.

Motivation and Meaning: "The Click" and Consciousness-Raising Groups

The click was the first step in the development of my respondents'

oppositional gender consciousness. First coined by Jane O'Reilly in her 1971 *Ms.*

article, "The Housewife's Moment of Truth," (O'Reilly 1971) the term, "the click,"

became an in vivo code that second-wave feminists used to mark the transformational

moment of their awakenings. Olivia described her moment this way: "Joining the

women's movement was like having a kid. There was a before and an after." After

experiencing "the click" my respondents no longer saw themselves as victims. They

had identified the underlying objective conditions that caused their subjective

feelings. They no longer felt as though they deserved the treatment they received.

Carol's comment captures the underlying sentiments my respondents felt. "It is hard

for women to think that women are worth being strong, worth being individuals,

worth being members of a group that has its own identity." Barbara told me her click

moment came in response to her feeling discounted and invisible:

> I sat in a circle with six men and me in the video collective office. I started to
> speak about what I thought should happen. These dudes ignored me. They
> were looking around not giving any credence to what I was saying. So it
> happened once. Then I said another thing and they just spaced. I thought you
> guys are full of shit. I'm outta here. I've had it. I am not going to put up with
> this. You are not going to pay attention to and so you can just go talk to each
> other and I am going to California. And I did.

The "click" could happen anywhere. It often happened in "consciousness-

raising" groups, an example of what social movement scholars, following Evans and

Boyte (1992), call "free spaces."[18] Modeled after revolutionary China's "speak

bitterness" sessions, consciousness-raising groups consisted of six to eight women

who had heard about such groups through flyers posted on a bulletin boards, by word

of mouth, or by a women's newspaper announcement. Trudy described her feelings:

"It was such a heady thing to be in a room with all women where all of a sudden

we're seeing each other for the first time, as allies, not in competition with each

other." Olivia stressed the empowering aspect of consciousness-raising groups, which

gave participants an opportunity to envision and model alternative behaviors. "It was

the idea of understanding that we had common experiences with other women. Being

in places where your voice was stifled, not having any leadership opportunities,

feeling this second-class citizen."

These meetings took place in private homes, in church basements, or in

community centers on a weekly, biweekly, or monthly basis. The groups could last for

periods ranging from six months to several years. San Francisco's Glide Memorial

Church and the Women's Liberation Switchboard served as consciousness-raising

coordinating hubs. The format was simple. Mary explained:

> You had a set of topics you could cover, depending on what the women
> wanted to talk about. We talked about our relationships with men, our
> struggles with our boyfriends or our husbands, what was going on and how do
> we handle our sexuality. Issues about the division of labor came up, the fact
> that we were doing double time and that it wasn't fair because we worked too.
> We broke with the idea that we wanted to be like our mothers. We went
> around the room and the instructions were that each person should speak to
> the questions for a few minutes until we all had a chance to talk. There was no
> leader.

According to Rachel, who had been an organizer for a national left

organization:

> [The purpose of these groups was to] open up the space for someone to be a
> woman and to be a whole range of things that had not been seen as possible
> for women. It's all up for grabs. There is no assumption that you have to fight
> against. You have to figure it out from scratch.

My respondents' work settings affected the kind of consciousness-raising

group they joined. Those feminists in "only-woman" workplaces (where they were

the only woman or one of few) chose community-based consciousness-raising groups

away from their workplaces in order to keep a low profile in their departments. By

contrast, those women in "women-only" contexts (where there were women and few

men around them) who did participate in consciousness-raising groups did so with coworkers after hours. They assumed their coworkers would be like-minded or, at least, not threatened.

Becoming Women-Identified

The second step in developing an oppositional gender consciousness involved becoming "women-identified," an in vivo code. Being women-identified meant recognizing women's shared experiences. Rachel told me about her moment of realization:

> Driving in the country, I saw a woman hanging up clothes on the line. I felt this sort of identity with her. This is the sort of work women do everywhere. I felt like that was happening all the time and that this was a women's liberation experience. . . . You come to understand that you are part of a group; that other people think the same way that you do; that they have had the same experiences. It brought me into a community rather than thinking that what I was experiencing was my own and nobody else's.

Experiences like this were critical to my respondents' development of their collective feminist identity.

Being women-identified meant my respondents rejected the self-hate that came from their internalization of the mainstream's negative messages about women. Mary explained her breakthrough this way: "I lived in a culture of patriarchal, traditional relationships. I was basically intimidated and allowed myself to feel badly." She realized that her fearful, desiring-to-please behavior with her boyfriend replicated her relationship with her father:

> For the first time I put myself in the center of my life, not losing myself or living vicariously through my male partner. I remember this poem I wrote that

68

described it as this cellophane, taking the cellophane off my body piece by piece and every time I took the little piece of cellophane off that piece of me would breathe. I had just become so self-hating in that relationship.

Increasing self-confidence gave my respondents the strength to acknowledge that competition between women for male attention undermined their growing solidarity. Rachel explained:

I think there was a lot of time in my life that I didn't trust women, that you couldn't trust them, they would always put men first and be conniving to take advantage of you. The women's movement opened me up. I started really caring about women a lot. That kind of not trusting disappeared.

She strongly believed that "women are sisters." She was critical of women who preferred spending time with men because they thought men were more interesting company:

We were really trying not to do that. It was a very important value in our group to be sisters with other women. When we had conflicts with other women we would try working them out and seeing them as conflicts set up by the system that we needed to overcome.[19]

Rejecting the Patriarchal Gaze

The fourth step my respondents took to develop their oppositional gender consciousnesses involved rejecting the dominant patriarchal image of femininity, creating an alternative vision, and changing how they felt about themselves and how they appeared to others. Irrespective of their class backgrounds, their occupational choices, or their sexual preferences, all the women I interviewed felt bad about their bodies. The ideal beauty standard, that women should be slender, have narrow waists, big breasts, and long legs, did not fit my respondents' realities. As Christina told me:

69

When I was a teenager, I imagined that I would wear beautiful heels, nylon stockings, and pretty clothes and live in a beautiful house. That's what I imagined for myself. I had internalized a lot about how I didn't fit. I figured a glamorous dress and having a beautiful house. I figured that every man wanted a short curvy blond person and I didn't look like that Hollywood person. The women's movement, I am sure, enabled me to give up those images of myself.

Being overweight, having hairy arms and legs, and being flat-chested were three issues that plagued my heterosexual, bisexual, and lesbian respondents. Lynn complained, "I was big and tall and fat. I wore size 16 and 18 dresses. The only clothes I could wear in those sizes were gray, blue, and brown at the end of the dress rack." Molly told me, "I was awkward. I matured physically late. I was short and out of it." Susan confessed, "I didn't have breasts. I padded my bras. My hips were like battleships. My arms and legs were hairy." Rachel described herself as "a very 'beige person.' I was invisible and insignificant in the world." Carol recalled, "Kids used to call me feather duster beanpole. I was a very skinny kid with bushy, unruly hair, going one way or another. I didn't have a positive image." Susan was the daughter of a wealthy Midwestern businessman who insisted she accept the honor annually bestowed by city's chamber of commerce on the eldest daughter of the most successful business that year. This honor required Susan to become the queen in the chamber of commerce beauty pageant parade, stand on a moving float, wear a long gown and tiara, and wave to the crowd. "I was raised to be an object. I had to be queen for the whole debutante cotillion year." Two of my lesbian respondents, not yet aware as young girls of their sexual preferences, suffered the most. They didn't fit the feminine image at all and were stereotyped as "other." Diane was heavyset, short, and

sturdy. Her sister was the "beautiful one." Sarah was tall, with an athletic build, broad

shoulders, short hair, and strong hands. She came out in her twenties as a bisexual

with a primary emphasis on relationships with women. "My family was not surprised.

They knew before I did. It was not exactly a hidden thing to my friends and to others.

People would assume because I have a relatively athletic body that I was a lesbian."

My respondents' decisions to reject traditional, patriarchal beauty standards

raised questions for them about how to represent themselves to others as feminists in

the way they chose to dress, to look, and to use body language. My heterosexual and

lesbian respondents saw this issue differently. For Olivia, a heterosexual woman, the

challenge was dealing with men: "How can you be a woman, be a feminist, be strong,

and still be attractive to men?" For Rachel and the other lesbian feminist respondents,

identifying as lesbians did not mean that they no longer considered themselves

women. Although attractiveness to men was not Rachel's issue, her story about a

lesbian who always wore boots and work shirts is relevant to Olivia's dilemma. Her

point: what it is to be a woman and to be attractive to men is socially constructed, not

pre-ordained by the patriarchy:

> [This woman] put her boot up on the table. She like slammed it on the table
> and said, "This is a woman's boot. I am a woman. This boot is my boot.
> Therefore, it is a woman's boot." We were about trying to open up the space
> for someone to be a woman and be a whole range of things that had not been
> seen as possible for women.

An elaborate critique of patriarchal beauty standards was behind my

respondents' detailed choices about the kinds of shoes to wear, whether to wear pants

or dresses, to shave bodily hair, to wear a bra, to put on makeup, and to color or cut

one's hair. Intimate habits are hard to break. "For years, I wouldn't think of going out

of the house without makeup," Irene confessed. My respondents no longer wanted to

conform with a dress code that emphasized physical attributes intended to enhance

their sexual attractiveness to men. Rachel told me, "I wore loose-fitting clothes so I

didn't have to show my body much. I was into hiding a lot. I knew I didn't want to be

out there as a sexual being. That that was dangerous.*"* My respondents objected to

wearing tight clothes and low-cut shirts, having belted, cinched waists and bras that

pushed their breasts up and forward, nylon stockings, short skirts, and high heels that

showed off their legs. No more wearing hair curlers at night that made sleep difficult,

dying their hair blond to meet the Hollywood ideals, or putting on makeup to "fix

their faces." These beauty standards were judged as artificial, constraining, unsafe,

impractical, and unhealthy. Mary shared her friend's reaction to a woman giving a

speech wearing stiletto heels:

> She said, "That women is wearing slave clothes." The idea was that she was
> dressing in a way that was bad for her body, bad for her back. It was
> unsafe. . . . When my son graduated [from college], I wanted to buy a loose
> camisole to wear under my dress. The saleslady tried to get me to buy a form-
> fitting thing. She said I should have a little more foundation and more breasts.
> I wore it for about ten minutes and then ripped it off. I can't stand this thing! I
> took it off and there was this wonderful sense of relief. This is how I want to
> feel! I want to feel grounded, comfortable, and safe.

Rachel objected to women's clothing that didn't have pockets so that women

had to carry heavy purses that threw them off balance. Sarah disliked U.S.-made

women's pants that that presumed narrow waists:

> Now that I am a carpenter, I wish I could find American women's pants that
> would fit me. They are hard to find because of my boy shape. I have a

European body shape. I did fine when I went shopping in Germany, but I don't live in Germany.

My respondents also resented the fact that these clothing choices hampered their ability to move freely. Women in flat shoes could walk purposively without wiggling their hips. Mary, a heterosexual woman, was concerned about safety. "If someone is chasing you, you can run, you can move."

To counter female beauty standards they regarded as demeaning, my respondents adopted an alternative set of principles to guide their sartorial practices. Overall, my respondents felt that clothing and appearance should de-emphasize their womanly features, allow active movement, be loose-fitting, natural, functional, and organic. In response to my question "What do you like and dislike when you look at yourself in the mirror?" none of my respondents mentioned their breasts, waist, hips, legs, or flat stomach. Meredith's answer emphasized her agency. She told me, " I like my hands. I can make things with them. I like my feet. They take me places." Rachel's students echoed Meredith's preferences: "When I taught women's studies classes, I asked my students what part of their bodies they liked. It was always hands, eyes. A couple of students liked their feet. They didn't emphasize their womanliness." Hiding signs of womanliness and dressing in masculine fashion were two ways my heterosexual, bisexual, and lesbian respondents limited their exposure to being seen as sex objects. Susan, a bisexual woman, customarily wore a multi-colored caftan or a muumuu that covered all signs of her body shape from head to toe: "Nobody knows what shape I am." Olivia, a heterosexual woman, used a vest over

her shirts and sweaters to hide her breasts. Rebecca, also heterosexual, insisted that she always dressed modestly and simply. "I don't like to stick out. I don't wear bright colors." Another strategy to obscure womanliness was to appear childlike and asexual. Christina who functioned in the predominantly male world of science, wore pigtails. The practice of dressing in a way customarily regarded by society as masculine was used by both heterosexual and lesbian women. The standard feminist uniform was a T-shirt or a flannel shirt, jeans, and sandals or boots. Olivia, a bisexual woman, told me, "I was wearing more and more masculine clothes. I wore desert boots and jeans. I wanted to be tough. I had a conflict about what was feminine and what wasn't." To solve the problem of no pockets in women's clothing, Rachel chose overalls. "Overalls were great because they had pockets and weren't tight fitting. They were very practical. There was also a physical and a working-class aspect."

For my respondents who were lesbians, the choice to wear pants, overalls, and work boots signified more than avoiding the male gaze. Appropriation of qualities associated with men, valuing and revisioning qualities that patriarchal culture devalued, and still identifying as female were key elements of a new lesbian collective identity. Rachel believed that "straight people don't get what we were about—lesbians were really pushing the boundaries of what women could be." Rachel told me about her "coming out" ritual experience:

> The first thing I did was put on boots which I had bought in a thrift store. I had never worn boots before. A lot of us were experimenting. It was sort of part of the coming out ritual. I wore a lot of tailored men's shirts and levis and work boots and a vest. We had an exercise that you should walk outside thinking you were a man. I realized my entire body changes, longer strides, firm feet on the ground, a little faster, walking very straight ahead, confident,

74

not looking down. I felt like my back was straighter, my whole body was different.

Wearing pants, flat shoes, or boots helped my respondents achieve freedom of movement. Rachel explained, "I wore levis so I could sit with my legs apart. I could sit with my foot on my knee." Mary's working conditions influenced her decision to wear pants. She told me, "When I realized you are allowed to wear pants at work, I gave up skirts, especially the miniskirts. It is too hard to sit on the floor in miniskirts with third graders." For Diane, a lesbian who had recently "come out," wearing pants meant acknowledging her identity: "When I was a kid, I wanted to play softball. I always wanted to wear pants."

In the interests of appearing natural and not artificial, my respondents gave up styling their hair, wearing makeup, and shaving their bodily hair, and took up exercise and eating organic food. For Susan, the one-time beauty queen, allowing her hair to grow naturally signified that she was rebelling against her class background by refusing to fit into the debutante mold. "On my twenty-first birthday, I told myself that I am never, never going to a beauty parlor again. That was in 1961." Carol, who is Jewish and who as a young girl had been "a very skinny kid with bushy, unruly hair, going one way or another," was no longer willing to use curlers or get permanents to fit into the American WASP, straight-blond-hair ideal. Instead, she let her hair grow in an imitation of an Afro, which she called a "Hebro." She told me, "I stopped straightening my hair. I was amazed that my hair looked fine without gigantic

rollers. I wanted to be as radical as I could, but I still wanted to be seen as a woman. I wore very stylish earrings."

Almost all of my respondents stopped wearing makeup. They considered makeup an artifice designed to make them hide their imperfections, lose their individuality, and conform to an idealized vision of beauty. Elizabeth, in particular, complained about the dangerous, unhealthy chemicals contained in makeup. Rebecca explained, "I have never been somebody who wore makeup, or wore it much, or wore it well. I could never understand how to put it on, and so I decided I didn't care." Among all of my respondents, Elizabeth and Sarah took exercise and healthy eating the most seriously. Elizabeth, in fact, ran marathons and was one of the first women to climb Mt. Everest:

> I have zillions of T-shirts which say "National Champion." I work out every day. I am very concerned with health and so I am very serious about what I eat. Every morning, I have a fruit drink. I make it in my blender with six different fruits and ginger, sunflower, and flax seeds. I don't eat sugar, or drink alcohol.

Sarah now has food politics as her political focus:

> I am currently active in personal politics around food and disease. I had a dietician come in for three sessions to look at food in relation to my ADD. I have gone from changing the world to changing your body—what you can control and have an impact on. I am into the politics of diet now.

My respondents' adoption of these stylistic practices ranged along a continuum from traditional, to a hybrid mix of traditional and feminist, to the feminist uniform of jeans, T-shirt, flannel shirt, and flat shoes—either sandals or boots—to a masculine or "butch style." Irene, a heterosexual academic, was a traditionalist. Shy

76

about her breasts, she never gave up wearing a bra. She didn't want to offend her

daughter and dressed to conform to the expectations of her audience:

> I am very shy about my breasts and being braless would draw more attention.
> I dress to fit in with where I am. Clothes are a prop. I am somewhere in
> between someone who has her hair and nails done. I have always dressed
> simply and modestly.

Carol, an academic in the humanities, was next on the traditional-to-butch

style/appearance continuum. Unlike Christina, the only woman scientist in her

department, who downplayed her womanliness by putting her hair in childlike

pigtails, Carol had other women around. She felt comfortable with a hybrid approach

that she called "differently pink." She told me:

> I am not a jeans girl, so I am kind of in between. I don't wear a bra or shave. I
> put natural Vaseline on my eyelashes to look good, but be natural. I care, but I
> am not obsessed with dressing. I basically wear comfortable clothes that are
> differently pink. I dress each day in a variant of black pants, a blouse, and a
> scarf.

Rachel, the lesbian feminist who chose overalls, considers her style moderately butch.

"I shop in the men's department. I don't like women's clothes. They don't have

pockets. When I go to a party, I wear a better shirt, a tie, and a different pair of men's

pants."

Almost all my respondents regarded decisions around how to dress as flexible

depending on the context and the audience. They were willing to accommodate to

dominant norms in public settings at work, or in public events with family. Wearing

feminist or lesbian-style clothing was reserved for community events with like-

minded others, and in the privacy that home afforded. At work with authority figures,

my respondents were motivated by self-interest to keep their jobs. Sarah, the

professional who dropped out of a mainstream job to start her own

contracting/carpenter business, typifies this flexibility:

> My suit has sort of atrophied on the line. I don't carry a briefcase. I am a bag
> lady. I have a very well-developed set of bags in pairs. I usually carry two for
> all the stuff. I carry food, stuff to keep myself busy. I have my dress-up for
> professional meetings, nice and possibly feminine for fundraisers, and my
> work construction stuff. Then I have my T-shirts around the house. I move
> things from one area to another as they get worn.

Similarly, Irene admitted, "I don't wear jeans when I teach. I wear pantsuits. If I am

applying for a teaching job, I just try to look like what will get me the job. I always

try to look as professional as I can." As did Diane, the lawyer:

> I do have a suit if I go to court. I wear pants, but not those black suits. I call
> them "outfits." I look silly in these man-tailored suits. I do wear earrings. I
> never wear heels and other jewelry. I carry a briefcase. That is for my lawyer
> stuff. If I am properly dressed, I look like I am dressed for court. That is all I
> care about. I never wore overalls. I probably wore flannel shirts.

And Carol:

> I tried to make myself different than who I was to reach other people. I have
> to go to Washington [for project funding] so often and go to conferences. I
> had nothing at all to equip me for that level of work. I borrowed from other
> people. In Washington, people dress rather boringly and wore sort of timeless
> things. They were sort of expecting this raving radical. They were calmer
> when they saw I could behave. I wore white pearls.

Rachel gave an example of the conflicted compromise my respondents had to make

with family members they wanted to please when joining them in public places:

> My parents were having a fiftieth wedding anniversary and they had this
> church ceremony and renewed their vows. Their only request was that I wear
> a dress. I did, but I didn't shave my legs. I wore these thick stockings and two-
> inch heels. My whole family had taken bets on whether I would wear a dress.

Dress could also be used as a form of resistance. Invited by a potential funder to have lunch at a men-only membership club in Washington, DC, Carol objected to meeting at this venue and challenged her host about the club's restriction. Her host replied, "You are interested in being funded, aren't you?" On the day of the appointed meeting, Carol appeared in a topcoat, spats, a bowtie, a red carnation in her lapel. She made a statement: "My body is here as you requested, but my mind and heart are not."

While my respondents could alter their dress and appearances as the context warranted without much psychological difficulty, the decision to not shave bodily hair or wear high heels to be attractive to men was a stumbling block for several of my heterosexual respondents. Christina did not reject the patriarchal norm that men should be taller than women. She admitted sheepishly:

> Well, I am tall. I like heels, but I don't wear them very much. The man that I was with for five years was my height. The man that I have been with twenty-eight years is shorter than me. I am not inclined to wear heels and tower over him.

Mary could not bring herself to stop shaving her body hair. She felt that her body, arms, and legs were excessively hairy and was, as a consequence, reluctant to go to swimming or wear sleeveless clothes. While she no longer prioritized dressing to be attractive to men and favored instead loose-fitting clothes, no makeup, and comfortable shoes, she drew the line at not shaving. Embarrassed, she admitted she routinely waxed her legs and arms and shaved her underarms. In contrast, however, for my lesbian respondents not shaving and wearing boots were badges of honor. As

such, these practices signified defying the "male gaze" and accepting and celebrating

naturalness. Rebecca:

> I stopped shaving when I first got involved in the women's movement. I had very hairy legs and pretty hairy armpits. Shaving was a nightmare for me. I always cut myself. I always remember shaving in the bathtub and crawling into cold sheets. My whole legs would be broken out with very little red pimply things all over. We used to have contests about who had the hairiest legs. Well, this is a woman's body and this is how I come so like it or leave it. This is what I find attractive in other woman. It is one of those beauty standards that I feel like I let go of really easily was the sort of hair thing.

Adopting a New Name

For several of my respondents, assuming a new first and/or last name

represented the final, culminating fifth step in the development of their oppositional

gender consciousness. This practice meant that these women were now willing to

project their personal transformations to the outside world. The names these women

chose and the reasons for their choices illustrate different aspects of the feminist

critique of traditional family and marriage customs. For example, Susan reminded me

about traditional nineteenth-century inheritance laws that passed family wealth from

father to son, negating a woman's rights to own property or to obtain credit. She

opposed the practice whereby a wife and her children assumed the husband/father's

surname as their own. In protest, Susan discarded her family of origin's surname and

instead took the surname "X" to point out that she was owned by no one. Similarly,

Barbara opposed the loss of her individual identity that came from taking her

husband's surname when they married:

In the early '70s, I was married to a guy named Robert Becham. I was in a doctor's office's waiting room and a nurse came in the room called out, "Mrs. Robert Becham?" I didn't do anything. I just kept reading. Then I realized she is talking to me!

When she divorced her husband, she took back her family name and revised her first name to affirm the qualities forbidden to women. "I can't stand my [first] name. I was a tomboy and I was damned if I would be connected with that name. It's a name for sissies!" Trudy dropped her both her "maiden" and her married surname altogether. "I didn't know you didn't have to change your surname when you married." She became known by the name of a Latin American women resistance fighter she admired. Christina, the scientist in a male-only environment, wanted to appear serious and professional. Overall, her strategy was to divide herself into two: "Christina" in her public work life and "Chris" in her private, family and community life.

Developing Practices Supporting Oppositional Gender Consciousness

My respondents' anti-materialist and anti-careerist beliefs fostered a set of practices that facilitated my respondents' abilities to translate their beliefs into practice. Economizing was one of these practices. Elizabeth proudly told me, "I live on very little. I count every penny and tally it each month. I buy overripe fruit at the farmer's market, which doesn't cost a lot." Barbara told me, "I can live on very little money. I am not an extravagant person. I am very conscious of budgets and money and how much this and that costs. I am very frugal." Jane's strategy was to rely on secondhand stores: "I like shopping at thrift stores and at Goodwill." Variants of

81

phrases like these threaded through my interviews of women coming from upper-

class, upper-middle-class, and working-class backgrounds alike.

Taking low-status, low-skilled, or unskilled jobs was another practice,

particularly for those respondents who chose to have movement/day jobs. These

women all had college degrees. Some had master's degrees. One had a PhD. Barbara,

the visual artist and sculptor, told me, "I had every dumb job in the whole world. I

had jobs for $3.25 per hour just to keep it together." Rachel's remark echoed

Barbara's:

> I did all sorts of odd jobs in the city. I cleaned movie theaters. There was a
> cleaning collective for cleaning movie theaters that I joined. I cleaned
> offices—a little vacuum cleaner, and I'd go in at night and clean offices. I
> worked in a men's clothing store.

Lynn explained how she supported her artistic career:

> I got a part-time job driving a van for an alternative magazine distributor that
> distributed organic gardening and some other of those magazines. But the way
> this distributor really made their money was, they had the *Rolling Stone*
> account and the *Hustler* account. So I ended up taking *Hustler*s into a few of
> our stores. Anyway, I would drive this van around, taking magazines and
> picking up other ones. By then, I had come out as a lesbian. So it was this kind
> of alternative job, and I made enough money to support myself.

Another practice was to create supportive social networks based on friendship

and/or identity. Single, heterosexual women and lesbian women, lacking the

privileges that association with men could have provided, relied on social networks to

navigate their economic insecurity. Jane, a divorcée, opened the door to greet me with

the remark, "Welcome to my rented house! I have never been an owner. My friends

help me find these beautiful places." Rachel told me how pre-existing, nonpolitical, and informal lesbian networks helped her:

> One of the university's vice presidents was lesbian, a positive, old-time professional dyke. She supported me a lot under the table privately. But she could not, and did not support what we were doing. She always thought women's studies was a little suspect. We whined too much, and were weak women who encouraged women to be weak. I realized the university kept renewing my semester appointments each semester. I finally called the vice president up and said, "I need to figure this out. I really need health insurance." She said, "Well, of course you do!" I said, "I had discovered that if I had a full year appointment, I could get insurance. The university keeps renewing my appointment every semester." She said, "That's all it would take?" I said, "That's my understanding." And she said, "Let's do it!" And it was done! I was amazed. I had insurance the next week!

My respondents also cultivated relationships with politically sympathetic insiders in mainstream institutions such as banks, credit unions, realty companies, and law firms. These insiders formed an invisible network of individuals willing to bend rules and develop creative ways to sustain movement projects. These networks made it also possible for activists to obtain mortgage loans and acquire title, to post bail when they were arrested for civil disobedience, and to avoid courtroom appearances and jail time. Finally, several of my respondents helped to establish or joined an alternative economy based on bartering. Sarah, a contractor and carpenter, participated in an alternative bartering economy. She worked out of her car, traveling with tools in her trunk to reduce her business expenses. When she had a job that required a workspace or more tools, she called on Cooperative Roots, a network that facilitated exchange of services and equipment.

I turn next to Chapter 4 to tell my respondents' stories about how the ways they translated their found oppositional gender consciousness into workplace practices.

CHAPTER 4. OPPOSITIONAL WORKPLACE GENDER PRACTICES

Transitioning From the Movement: Activists' Individuation

As the '60s noise of public protest subsided, former second-wave feminist activists, now older, began to turn their attention to how to make a living and—if they so chose—to support a family. As the '70s continued, most of my respondents, once young students, now were mature adults with responsibilities. Most had partners. Some had children. Total commitment to the movement's ideals was hard, if not impossible, to sustain. Their desire to remain politically active was in competition with the requirements of paid employment, the need to balance work with family, and, in some cases, their partners' resistance to their leaving full-time domesticity. Whalen and Flacks (1989) call the process of turning towards private life "individuation" (Whalen and Flacks 1989: 147–56, 157–58, 184,147, 265–66). Feminist activists' individuation meant moving away from their totalist attitudes—the identification of their personal and social needs and desires with those of movement's goals and its collective good.

There were multiple reasons underlying this individuation. The end of the Vietnam War in 1974 was an important factor behind my respondents' decision to redirect their energies towards their personal lives. The Vietnam War's end had undermined the raison d'être for the New Left's antiwar mobilization and affected the women's movement's vitality. The mobilization, which had once helped to galvanize second-wave feminists' actions and had served as a target for its critique of

patriarchal ideologies and practices, no longer offered the women's movement a

valuable resource for recruits and training.

Economic downturn also played a role. After years of sustained growth, the

economy was at a standstill. Inflation and unemployment were rising. It became

harder to live cheaply and marginally as a single woman without privilege or

protection, and harder still as a single parent or as a lesbian. Olivia and Irene,

heterosexual women who both were single parents, provide examples of one solution

in the face of economic hardship that was available to women who were willing to

enter predominantly male fields. As feminists, both women wanted to achieve the

goal of economic self-sufficiency. Both decided to go to graduate school for

professional training. Irene enrolled in a PhD program in the social sciences. Olivia,

who had become the owner of a women-run printshop, told me about her decision to

close the printshop:

> The Reagan years were terrible for us. We [the printshop] kept slipping down
> economically and losing track. In the early '80s, I had my baby and a really
> rough divorce. I was pretty much in survival mode for a good to five to seven
> years. . . . I was encouraged by a colleague to go back to school to an MA
> degree so that I could teach [printing] at a community college and do
> administrative work. . . . I reluctantly decided to do it.

Irene, a working-class, heterosexual feminist activist with a mentally unstable single

mother to support, explained with a great deal of irony that, although she considered

herself a feminist opposed to the treatment of women as sex objects, she had,

nonetheless, chosen to, as she put it, "capitalize" on her good looks to support herself

and her mother by modeling and selling cosmetics. Now she needed a financially

stable career and a more balanced life:

> I had to solve our financial problems. I am going to have to do this the hard
> way. I am going to have to get an education! I couldn't afford to go to the
> University of California. It was a pittance, but we couldn't even get from one
> month to the next. . . . I had to get a personal life, I can't just save the world. I
> got all caught up in the political stuff, fighting the war, the Cambodian crisis,
> tear gas, the demonstration, and People's Park.

> Organizational difficulties and political disagreements within the women's

movement were another factor that caused my respondents to distance themselves

from the movement. Olivia didn't like the direction movement politics was taking:

> The movement became this politics of identity. I wasn't interested in that at
> all. I find it is a real drag, a big waste of time. Everybody splintered in all
> directions and it wasn't something I ever wanted to hook up with because it is
> so divisive.

Diane was frustrated with the New Left and feminist movements' organizational

commitment to consensus decision-making. At the height of the '60s movement,

Diane worked in a Legal Aid Society's women's litigation unit and in a prisoner's

legal collective. Then she started a lesbian rights center. Although she never joined a

mainstream law firm, she did set up her own solo private practice. "I never thought I

would do that, but I did. I was just sick of the board's endless meetings and having to

be nice to people I didn't like." Barbara, a painter and sculptor—who was once active

in the Videofreex, a collective that filmed '60s political events, and in the Guerrilla

Girls, a feminist group that advocated the inclusion of women artists in public

exhibitions—felt similarly:

I'm not that interested in groups. I found that out about myself with the Videofreex. There were ten of us, and after about a year and a half or so, I got really bored with having ten different opinions before anything could be moved from A to B. I don't give a shit. Going around in circles and all this discussion, it bores the tears out of me.

Getting Stronger in Mind and Body

For many of my respondents, the third step in their evolving oppositional gender consciousnesses was enrolling in assertiveness training classes. These classes were intended to teach women communication techniques that would effectively challenge those who wanted to keep them in a subordinate place. Trudy's efforts in her teenage years exemplifies the lengths young women went to please prospective dates:

> I was smart and I wanted to be smart. If you are smart, boys won't like you, and if boys don't like you, you won't have a decent life. I did everything short of being dumb. I didn't take physics because girls don't take physics. I gave up athletics, even though I wanted to do something. It was a pretty conscious decision that I wasn't going to be good at sports. Because I wanted to be smart and it was going to be too much for boys to accept.

According to Rachel, the consequences of such behavior for women growing up in the '50s was "a kind of pretend helplessness. . . . Women were powerful and strong all along, but we pretended not to be. Pretending to be stupid, you know. It's like that is not okay."

Taught by women for women, these women applied lessons learned in consciousness-raising groups to their own psychological and behavioral transformations. Barbara, who had been raised in a household where manners and politeness were essential, learned that:

88

It is much easier to be in life if you are not allowing yourself to be stomped on. It is a question of seizing power. They are not going to give it to you. You have to take it or earn respect. . . . I had to learn not to be taken advantage of. I grew up being taken advantage of. The women's movement gave me permission to think a whole different way.

To overcome fears about male violence, several respondents signed up for martial arts training. Rachel, a lesbian, explained the reasoning behind feminists' interest in martial arts. "We have been so used to relying on men to take care of us. We understood it was a trap and that men protect us from other men." Mary, who was raised by an always angry father and had separated from an equally angry boyfriend, recounted how taking tai chi changed her life:

When I left him [my boyfriend], I started doing things by myself. I started doing tai chi quite intensively. I think my body actually did become stronger and I stood up straighter. I had a different attitude in the world from doing tai chi. Tai chi was very helpful in helping me overcome some of the self-hate I had. I became more centered and grounded. Also I was around women more.

Olivia's assertiveness training helped her on the job. Given the only-woman environment she was in, she told me:

I had to assert myself. This is what my job is. One time running the big presses a teacher came in and said, "What are you doing here?" I told him you shouldn't have hired me, if you weren't going to trust me. I really had to push back and push hard against these guys to maintain a place for myself in the department.

Barbara's words summarize the effect of assertiveness training on my respondents. Assertiveness training gave my respondents a necessary psychological tool to implement their oppositional gender practices: "I am no longer a pushover. Those days are over, honey. . . . If we as women are going to take power at all, we are going to have to carve it out one by one. You have to grab it. You have to want it."

89

What They Took with Them: Olivia's Vision and Practices

My respondents' individuation processes meant leaving the cocoon the '60s

movement had provided. Olivia's experience in her women-owned printshop provides

a glimpse of the New Left/feminist practices my respondents took with them as they

brought their beliefs and practices into their everyday workplaces. At college, Olivia

was involved with the antiwar, anti-imperialist movement and, within that, the

women's movement. "We were street fighters." Coming to the Bay Area, she

continued her political commitment and joined a women's printing collective. Then,

with several other women, she set up a printshop. Core principles of New

Left/feminism included consensus decision-making, opposition to hierarchical

structures and to a strict and narrow division of labor, equal monetary compensation,

and a rejection of formal, professional behavior that required separating feelings from

thoughts (Baxandall and Gordon 2000; Carlsson 2011). Olivia implemented these

beliefs as she and her partners decided the printshop's mission, organized the shop's

division of labor, created the decision-making process, the work culture, the financial

operations, and the dealings with external market competition.

> I saw myself as identifying with being a working-class printer, wage work,
> progressive, and more an anti-imperialist feminist. We were a movement
> printshop. I didn't take on women's issues, but I preferred the company of
> women. I always had ink on my hands. I had a toolbox. . . . I got a van and
> repaired my own van. I had a very expansive view of what women could do. I
> was really liking it.

The synergy of time and place in Berkeley and the '60s political climate swept

Olivia into something larger than herself. A totalist mindset guided her choices about

what work to do and whom to work with (Whalen and Flacks 1989). She did not

distinguish between her needs and the movement's. She became caught up in the

antiwar movement's emotions of anger and frustration. Making money wasn't an

issue. Political principles mattered. Olivia explained:

> It was that period of time when the war could make you crazy. It was so huge
> a war. There was that huge draft and everybody was feeling it and there were
> high passions around it. I was really involved in the women's movement and
> when the war was winding down, it just seemed to make sense to open a
> woman's press. We weren't interested in money. We wanted to do good work.
> I didn't become a printer just because I like to print. What I printed mattered.
> It was a very political decision. My beliefs would affect what I would print
> and who I would print for, who we wanted to serve, who our business clients
> were, how we priced things, and what we thought was important. I think we
> were pretty conscious. We wouldn't do anything just for commercial
> purposes. We weren't going to print for the Bank of America.

Olivia believed in cooperation, not competition. She sought alliances with

other printshops. Belonging to a union was a priority:

> I wasn't a capitalist. I knew how I wanted this shop to work. I wanted to go
> into business, but I wanted it to be a shared business, a large collective that we
> can all put our arms around. The first thing I tried to do was to go to other
> small companies and say, "Let's not compete against each other. . . . If
> someone comes to me, I want them to come to me because they want to work
> with me, not because I underbid you." So that is how I tried to organize
> externally so that we wouldn't be in competition with each other. It was a
> little tricky.

The shop's small staff made realizing these values feasible. Inside the shop,

Olivia and her partners structured equality into their job duties. They shared decision-

making and divided compensation equally. They did not follow the feminist practice

of rotating jobs so that everyone had the same skills, and no one was confined to

necessary but unpleasant tasks. Nor was there a sharp division of labor. Rather, each

person worked on tasks they were good at and interested in:

> We all shared our work together. I brought a partner in with me. I taught her
> how to print. We just kind of worked to our expertise and then we brought in
> letterpress people. We took our own areas and stayed with those. We didn't
> have clear-cut job duties. I was better at one kind of press and she was better
> at the other and so we divided it in those ways. She was a better graphic
> designer. I really liked the machines better. And it wasn't like everybody had
> to do everything. I think we both handled the business side.

Friendship ties and shared values created unspoken expectations and assumptions that

bound the printshop workers together (Polletta 2004a). Adhering to the feminist belief

that the personal is the political, decisions about the work content, process, and

compensation were value-oriented, not simply technical or strategic:

> Financially, we definitely shared. That is where it is easier for me—we all got
> the same amount of money. There was not a hierarchy. In those days, nobody
> got more than anybody else. We tried to share the way we were working. We
> didn't do it because the women's movement told us. Maybe we had
> internalized it. We kind of lived like that. We had a model of consensus.
> There wasn't anything written down about how we were going to operate.

In the midst of the '60s social movements, political and ideological considerations

informed practical decisions: "We all had such strong feelings about things. . . . In

those first years, we were really working hard. In reality, our meetings were like a

consciousness-raising group. We really 'duked it out.' In a way, I am glad we did."

Earning a Living: Working Within the Bureaucracy, Being Independent, or Staying the Course in a Movement/Day Job

Eight of the seventeen women I interviewed worked in California's public

higher education institutions, a three-tiered large bureaucratic system composed of

92

multiple public research universities, state teaching universities, and two-year community colleges. Five of the eight (Christina, Carol, Irene, Rachel, and Olivia) took positions that, with the exception of Rachel's (in women's studies), were in predominantly male disciplines in university, state, or community college bureaucracies as professors, lecturers, or project directors. Three of the eight (Rebecca, Meredith, and Jane) chose work in female-segregated jobs in university bureaucracies as clerical workers and office managers. Of the nine respondents who did not work in the California higher education system, two worked in female-segregated positions as K–12 public school teachers, four became independent professionals, and three persisted outside the mainstream, subsidized by inherited wealth, marginal part-time jobs, or earning a living in what I call movement/day jobs—cleaning houses, taking care of children, or driving delivery trucks. Despite the fact that their college education could have led to higher paying and more skilled work, this last three chose this kind of work for its flexibility and limited demands so that they could devote their energies without distraction to their preferred movement work.

For the women who chose predominantly male careers, deciding on a career path, how to get there, and how to behave was not straightforward. Olivia told me she had no role models or mentors to pave her way. "I was the only woman in my printing classes and in my department when I started." Her passion and interests drove her. As a young girl, she loved working with her hands, reading newspapers, and the sight and smell of printed text. "It makes my heart glad about the importance

93

of working with your hands." A self-described "doer" rather than a thinker, she said, "I never would have guessed that I would have become a printer. It was like pulling on a thread. I followed it and it made more and more sense." Carol, an undergraduate and graduate student in the humanities and later a director of project to archive and edit the papers of a famous feminist, also had no role models. "I had very few women professors."

Like Carol and Olivia, Christina wasn't clear about her career direction. Always an A student with wide-ranging interests in math, philosophy, and science, she considered pre-med or philosophy. Her father, a science professor, "lacking sons," encouraged her studies in a way that ended up being discouraging:

> He introduced me to the one female biochemist he knew, who was a terrible role model. She was absolutely lifeless. She was one of those women who worked in a lab about one fourth of the size of this room all by herself in a medical school and just kind of went to work and went home and nobody paid any attention, but she was a woman who worked at a bench, which I hadn't seen.

Christina's career path also wasn't straightforward. She didn't have a vision of what she wanted to accomplish and the way to reach her goals. Yet she forged her own way. "It wasn't like I decided to work as a chemist and then I worked every day to do that. It was much more haphazard than that. I wasn't trying to climb a career ladder." Like Olivia, Christina followed her heart. The convergence of her interest and external factors—Berkeley's synergy of time and place, the antiwar and civil rights political climate, the women's movement, and the availability of graduate student support helped her move forward on her trajectory:

I was lucky in the timing of things because at the same time I was getting these fellowships and acceptances to graduate school, I was also getting involved in the antiwar movement and then the women's movement so that if it all hadn't come together when it did for me, I probably wouldn't be a scientist.

My respondents who chose predominantly male occupations also faced barriers blocking their entry. In addition to the absence of role models to serve as mentors, Carol and Olivia faced two kinds of male resistance to their presence. First, male colleagues used the cultural reservoir of misogynist stereotypes to attack the two feminists verbally in everyday interactions. One of Carol's teachers, angered by her lateness to class after a demonstration, told her in front of other students, "All you women's liberationists will have in ten years is sagging breasts!" Another teacher called her a "cow" in contrast to his model male student, "a bull." She wasn't forceful enough when she spoke in class.

For Olivia, a printer, male resistance was expressed in words as well as through the content of the trade. In the first instance, an instructor's words implied that acting like a man (not crying) would be rewarded:

The instructor didn't want to take me [into his class] but he had to. Early on, I got my hand caught in the press and I crushed my fingers, but I unbolted the press, moved my finger out, and walked out the door. I didn't cry or say anything. I just went to the hospital. When I got back, he said, "You really have got balls! I wouldn't have taken you, but now I will."

Second, the very content of their disciplines affected the forms that male resistance assumed. In Carol's chosen field, the humanities, patriarchal bias was embedded in the production of disciplinary knowledge through the omission of women's contributions and in the scholarly interpretations of literary, artistic, and

95

philosophical works. Male resistance took the form of an abstract battle over words and ideas:

> I took my orals, and my professor and a few other people felt extremely threatened by my challenge to their interpretations of Plato and Hobbes. I brought in the domestic sphere. It wasn't as if I was a warrior, but they still felt threatened. The chair tried to fail me. The other people had to go around and reverse his action because it wasn't that I didn't know what I was supposed to know, but that I was doing a critique and it was before that era of where feminist critique was accepted. Now that is what political theorists do.

In Olivia's case patriarchal resistance extended to the materials of the trade. "Printing is about mixing water with ink. Once, the men sabotaged my work by mixing my chemicals with the wrong amounts of water."

In contrast to Carol, Christina, and Olivia, Rachel avoided direct male resistance when she chose to go into academia. She became involved in starting and teaching courses in women's studies programs on several campuses.[20] The field's newness, its experimental status, and the fact that the program had not been formally reviewed left Rachel room to maneuver. "My loyalty was to the movement." Being a part-time lecturer was a means to an end. Financial or job security was not paramount. "I wanted to figure out a way to earn a living. I've never cared about being rich. Half-time paid the rent." Her first job after college led to her involvement in women's studies. She became the women's coordinator of a national university-based organization that regarded itself as the intellectual arm of the '60s movement. She traveled around the country talking to university and college women faculty and community activists in different cities asking what they could do here to use the

university's resources for women and for the women's movement. "What we decided," Rachel said, "is that we could try and start women's studies."

Mary, Molly, Rebecca, Meredith, and Jane chose work in female-segregated occupations. Mary became an elementary school teacher and Meredith became a receptionist/clerical worker. Although both grew to enjoy their jobs, they entered female-segregated occupations by default, choosing the path of least resistance after experiencing what Connell (1987: 89–116, 119–139)[21] conceptualizes as the effects of "gender regimes," commonly known as the tracking system, implemented by school and college counselors who advised students about possible occupations based not on their interests or merits, but perhaps unconsciously, on the basis of their demographic characteristics—in this case gender and sexual preference—that reflected where society thinks they should be. Unlike Christina's teachers, who encouraged her to pursue a PhD, Mary's advisors discouraged her. She had hoped to be a history professor. She told me that her advisor said, "No, no, no. Don't go into history. That is very difficult." Her advisor may have had legitimate reasons for his remarks. Now she recalls, "At the time, I didn't think much of it. I followed his advice. In retrospect, it was just a boy's club." Similarly, Meredith wanted to be a researcher for a union, but encountered what she believed was their unwillingness to hire women:

> I applied for about ten research jobs in unions. After nine or ten, I was like, What is this? Do I have cooties? I found out that all the positions were filled by men. In at least three of these situations, the person hired was not only a man, but just like me fresh out of college.

97

Fearing impending "starvation," she leapt at the opportunity a friend held out to take a position as a receptionist at a major research university. She remained in the university, transferring laterally to other similar positions throughout her career. Molly, who became a high school teacher, had first considered becoming a pharmacist. In comparison to the others exposed to discouraging counselors, Molly altered her direction on her own because math was a prerequisite for a pharmacy education). Like many young girls in her generation, she had "math anxiety".[22]

Not all of my study respondents choosing clerical work or K–12 teaching did so by default. For Rebecca and Jane, the choice was positive and straightforward. Rebecca's interests, skillset, and politics fit nicely with clerical and administrative job duties. "I like it [clerical work], organizing things, putting them in order, relating to students, and sharing equipment." Similarly, Jane, with a humanities BA degree and no interest in graduate work, found great satisfaction in being a generalist, working in alternative schools, media, and as an administrator in a university in a creative, progressive, interdisciplinary undergraduate program, the kind of educational experiment that flourished in the '60s.

The other seven women opted not to pursue careers in large, bureaucratic organizations. Instead, they became independent professionals (Diane, Sarah, Barbara, and Elizabeth) or remained in what I have come to call movement/day jobs (Susan, Lynn, Trudy). Three of the seven (Susan, Lynn, and Barbara) had inherited wealth that supplemented their earned income. In contrast to my respondents who accepted positions in large higher education bureaucracies or public schools, these

women were willing to forgo job security, a regular salary, and a promise of long-term employment in order to achieve independence, freedom, and autonomy and to devote their energies to activism and creativity. Barbara was a painter and sculptor: "I am an artist. I work alone." Diane rejected the allure of corporate law firms to become a movement lawyer, never turning back: "I interviewed for one of those corporate law firms, but never in a million years would I work there." Over the course of her career, Diane worked for a legal prisoner's rights collective, a labor union, and a legal aid nonprofit. Ultimately, she launched her solo private practice in defense of worker's rights and against employment discrimination: "I just decided I would be my own boss. I have been doing that ever since." Elizabeth was a sociologist, a freelance researcher, a filmmaker, and an author. Her PhD thesis was well regarded, and it was about to be published by a prestigious university press when several scholars challenged her methodology. Angered by what she thought was the real reason—political disagreements masquerading as methodological criticism—Elizabeth gave up thoughts of a secure academic position and decided to strike out on her own: "I never went out on the job market." In her opinion, there was "too much stress. Too much sexism." Sarah became a carpenter and contractor. As a young girl, she always enjoyed building things: "Looking back, I was always interested in carpentry since I was a child. I did construction all the way through my life. There were little bits of projects I was able to do in school and in our apartment." She worked for ten years as an urban planner in several Bay Area city government agencies. One day, while "floating in the civic center's duck pond among the lilies"

during her lunch break/meditation time, she looked up and realized that the most interesting projects that came to her desk for review where the ones outside her jurisdiction. That's where she wanted to be, not inside a bureaucracy with rules and requirements. Turning away from parental expectations for the kind of professional career her parents wanted for her, Sarah moved in the direction of her childhood passion—carpentry and became a residential contractor and carpenter.

Trudy's and Lynn's commitment to full-time women's movement activism and to day jobs was an extension of their devotion to social justice instilled in them as children in their faith-oriented, churchgoing families. If she could do her life over, Lynn explained, she would have been a minister. Trudy's grandfather was an Episcopalian minister. The church was "[her] father's world." As college students, both went to Mississippi in the 1964 and volunteered to join the civil rights movement's, "Freedom Summer" project.[23] Trudy believed going to the South to register Mississippi's black citizens was "doing God's will. I wanted to change the world. I wanted justice." Lynn's focus on rectifying racial inequality stemmed from her experience of going to an integrated elementary school in the North followed by attending a segregated high school in the South because of her father's job relocation. Their involvement in the civil rights movement inspired their involvement in the women's movement. Lynn told me, "We understood oppression. It gave us a sense of history." Trudy told me that she married a black man to demonstrate the depth of her commitment to ending racism. She explained she wanted to show the world that her relationship with a fellow black civil rights activist "wasn't just a flighty experience

that would end up with marrying a white man and settling down to a comfortable life."

In contrast to Lynn and Trudy, Susan's decision to devote her life to full-time women's movement activism represented a sharp break from her family of origin. Her father was a top executive in a large military defense company. Her mother was a socialite. She did not need a day job. Her substantial inheritance made it possible for her to fund her feminist projects and hire staff.

Four of the women who chose either to become independent professionals or to have day jobs were lesbians or bisexuals. Their sexuality and the accompanying stigma, however, were not sufficient reasons for these women to choose to live outside the mainstream. My lesbian feminist respondents had jobs in the predominantly male professions, in the trades, and in female-segregated jobs. They, too, spoke about "not fitting" because they didn't conform to conventional feminine beauty standards or behavior. The decision to emphasize the positive rather than the negative aspects of their outsider status as lesbians differentiated movement/day jobs lesbians that I interviewed from their lesbian, mainstream counterparts. Unable to be open about their sexuality or to legally marry, their decisions to live in a women's community held the promise of meaning, solidarity, and empowerment. Rachel earned her living by part-time college teaching and working in a left-wing bookstore.

Oppositional Gender Workplace Practices

My respondents in predominantly male and in female-segregated jobs brought their radical feminist beliefs about equality, cooperation, consensus decision-making, non-hierarchal relations, and balance between family and work into organized settings built on hierarchy, individualism, and competition. Translating these beliefs into practice required negotiating the tensions between the internalized residues of movement commitment and their personal needs for economic survival, individual achievement, work/family balance, and spiritual well-being. Entering the workforce from the movement, both groups of women faced a set of dilemmas. Socialized to expect to be doing caring work in the home, how best to deal with bureaucratic rationality?[24] Opposed to hierarchy and advocating equality, cooperation, and consensus decision-making, how best to succeed in organizations that valued hierarchy, individualism, and competition? Now seeking paid work outside the home, my respondents lacked affordable childcare and—in the '60s and early '70s—access to legal abortions.[25] How then to balance the work demands with those of family in organizations traditionally predicated on a male worker with a wife at home responsible for their children?

Making this transition required facing organizational and cultural obstacles. Depending on whether my respondents chose predominantly male or female-segregated occupations, they found themselves in only-woman environments (where they were either the only woman or one of few) or women-only environments (where

there were women around them and few men). Both types of workplaces had features in common that contrasted sharply with my respondents' women's movement experiences. These features affected my respondents' abilities to translate their beliefs into practice. Jobs were now organized into clearly defined classifications, as well as specific functions and duties, rather than allocated according to my respondents' abilities and interests. Tasks were not volunteered or shared. Compensation was unequal. They found themselves in bureaucratic structures managed by top-down authority. Olivia put it this way: "I have got a boss. She has got a boss. When the chancellor says do something, she does it." Externally imposed discipline and tacit acceptance of professional behavior replaced the emotional glue of solidarity created by shared values and friendship. For Olivia, involved in both teaching and administrative work, decorum, a positive outlook, and professionalism replaced the passion and what Olivia referred to as the practice of "duking it out" that characterized her '60s movement printshop days. "I needed to stay calm and not talk about how badly things were going. We all had to face in the same direction and build a college culture and all that."

Despite these common features, however, the actual working conditions for my respondents in only-woman and in women-only positions were very different. Different expectations governed their behavior, the amount of discretion and autonomy allowed, the types of benefits and rewards women in predominantly male occupations and women in female-segregated jobs could receive, and the extent each could be involved in decision-making. These differences meant my respondents

experienced hierarchy, inequality, and the possibilities for resistance to authority differently. These different norms and regulations set the parameters for my respondents' opportunities to translate their beliefs into practices.

In what follows, I describe and compare how my respondents in predominantly male and female-segregated occupations addressed these dilemmas and fashioned oppositional gender workplace practices specifically for their working conditions. I compare these two categories of respondents in bureaucratic higher education to each other and contrast their practices with those practices of the respondents remaining outside the higher education and K–12 bureaucracies—the independent professionals and the feminists who persisted in their movement work earning their living with day jobs. I organize my respondents' oppositional gender workplace practices into five categories: (1) producing feminist knowledge and consciousness, (2) advocating for women's rights and issues, (3) challenging hierarchy and fighting for equality, (4) dealing with work/family balance, and (5) fostering feminist solidarity by establishing islands of care and community. I conclude this chapter by discussing, when relevant, the consequences my respondents faced and the trade-offs they made between their feminist ideals and the opportunities and constraints their respective jobs posed.

Producing Feminist Knowledge and Consciousness

My respondents who became professors developed feminist scholarship and consciousness as individuals and as part of collective actions in their professional associations. Their job functions—teaching, research, student advising,

administration, and university public service—became the vehicles for translating their feminist ideals into oppositional gender workplace practices. These efforts, however, happened within and against male-defined expectations about what constituted legitimate knowledge and appropriate subjects for inquiry, accepted research methods, curriculum content, and pedagogy. Like their male counterparts, these feminists were expected to be self-directed and have their own research, teaching, publishing, and public service agendas. They were expected to subscribe to the professional norms of academic behavior: being single-minded, putting the pursuit of knowledge and their work first, and being loyal to their home institutions and their national and international professions. They had a great deal of discretion, autonomy, and flexibility in their working hours, in scheduling their time, and in the way they participated in university and community service. The norm of academic freedom allowed feminist academics the opportunity to design their own syllabi. The university's commitment to public service provided a way for these women to engage in political activism within limits. Sabbaticals and release time awaited those attaining tenure.

My academic respondents' experiences in consciousness-raising groups and their readings of movement activists' manifestos, magazines, and pamphlets gave humanities professors Rachel and Carol, social scientist Irene, life scientist Christina, and Olivia, the printing teacher, the raw materials and the ideas for course topics as they put together some of the first-ever courses in higher education that were focused on women. Carol's description of her experience as a '60s graduate humanities

student—"There was nothing taught about women. We were focused on Plato, Aristotle, and Western civilization. Women just weren't there!"—characterizes the gender imbalance in her discipline as well as in other disciplines on University of California campuses and nationwide (Bowles and Klein 1983; Dubois et al. 1985). According to Rachel, "There wasn't all that much written at that point [the '70s]. I found readings, xeroxed copies, and did stuff like that."

From the outset, feminist curriculum design and scholarship were directed towards remedying the omission of women's history and experiences from traditional scholarship and curriculum. The omission was twofold. Not only were women not the subject of scholarship, but feminist scholars argued that a patriarchal bias was embedded in the disciplines' theoretical, methodological, and pedagogic paradigms. Feminist scholars' long-term goal was to employ a gendered lens to examine new concepts and theories to transform traditional scholarship and pedagogy (Bowles and Klein 1983). For Rachel, Carol, Irene, and Olivia, the classroom, the department office, the conference room, and their offices served as sites for their developing oppositional gender workplace practices.

The way that these academic feminists used the women's movement's raw material depended on their personal motivations, their individual disciplines' content, and on the institutional arrangements where they worked. Aware their choices could affect their prospects for job security and advancement, they had to decide how much they would conform or challenge traditional academic content and pedagogic conventions. As they developed new feminist knowledge, my academic respondents

106

were torn between their disciplinary training and the women's movement's demands to think outside the box. Scholars saw this dilemma located in the "dual character of feminist scholarship—its simultaneous formation out of disciplinary frameworks and out of the political, trans-disciplinary interests of women's liberation" (Dubois et al. 1985: viii).

Rachel and Carol had totalist motivations. Rachel prioritized loyalty to the movement over job security and salary:

> I have been very committed to the merging of my political work and my economic work. I saw myself as standing for a movement that had a reach and influence outside the academy, a movement for social justice in all kinds of ways.

Rachel's goal was to correct the omission of women's history and experience from much of previous scholarship and, drawing upon the legacy of consciousness-raising groups, inject topics not previously included in the curriculum. Given the status of feminist scholarship at the time, her own predilections, and her educational background (MA degree only), she did not critique the patriarchal bias in the academic canon or try to develop new feminist concepts. Her anti-materialist values and totalist mindset supported her risk-taking: "We judged that we had about ten years [before professionalization]. In my two teaching jobs at different institutions, I was ultimately forced to leave. Think about it. Think about who I am and what I believe in."

Like Rachel, Carol's loyalty to the women's movement motivated her oppositional workplace gender practices. "I was asked why I wanted to get a PhD. I

said it was to make a revolution. After all, Ho Chi Minh went to Paris to study. I felt

there were really important things to think through." Throughout her career as an

archivist and author, she retained her graduate student ideals and believed she had a

political responsibility "to preserve the legacy" of the nineteenth-century feminist

whose archive she manages. Carol did this by correcting the omission of this

woman's speeches, writings, and letters from the historical record:

> I have put myself in a position of serving a cause. I felt like I owed it to
> history and if I don't do it, it wouldn't be done and it was this remarkable
> amazing opportunity to fill in this gap in women's history. This is the kind of
> thing I am especially good at. I turned myself into doing that [a person serving
> a cause].

Applying the women's movement commitment to praxis, Carol believed that

educating young girls and women about this historical feminist's contributions was as

important as publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. She wrote K–12

curriculum modules for Women's History Month and International Women's Day.

By contrast, Irene's need for financial and job security outweighed her desire

for political expression and personal achievement. She moved away from full-time

political activism and secured a position in a Bay Area state university's social

science department that had a defined curriculum and graduation requirements. Fear

of being blacklisted, rather than fear of anti-feminist backlash, motivated Irene. She

knew that faculty with Communist Party affiliations were being driven out of the

academy, and she thought that "this is my last chance to have a career." She decided

to get out of the line of fire by aligning herself with social psychology and symbolic

interaction: "I decided I was going to retreat for practical reasons. All my friends

were getting fired for being communists. I decided to retreat into social psychology and to figure out the links between macro and micro by studying with Anselm Strauss."

Within the existing department curriculum, Irene mainstreamed feminist ideas and materials into her syllabus. In contrast to Rachel, who could design new courses in her fledging Women's Studies Program, Irene felt limited to modifying existing courses by adding new topics and critiquing concepts she considered patriarchal. "I taught the course on 'Marriage and Family' for 20 years. I talked about women's issues whenever I could." Irene felt more leeway to express her feminist views in her research agenda. As an activist, Irene had fought for women's reproductive rights. She brought those interests into the academy through her research on neglected and controversial topics in women's health.

Like Irene, Christina, a life sciences professor, worked within existing departmental structures and curriculum. She had to do this. Scientific research required lab space, equipment, and more resources than a single individual could muster. Her love of science and the material and psychological rewards she received were sufficient to allow her to overcome any reservations she might have had: "I knew I was working for my PhD. I knew I wanted it. I loved the opportunities that I got when I kept going in my education and I didn't want to stop to become a hausfrau the way that my mother had."

While the content of the humanities and social disciplines provided Rachel and Irene the material to critique and counter the ideological hegemony of the patriarchal mainstream, Christina's discipline set the parameters of her possibilities:

> I don't see biochemistry itself as having a gender. I don't think I could have done what I did if science wasn't neutral. I think one reason I did science was that I could make this separation and make it comfortably. We weren't talking in class about any personal issues. Our classes were mostly labs. That's what I like about science. I don't think I would have made it in the social sciences because I get in arguments with people about the social stuff but in science we can talk chemistry or biochemistry.

However, Christina was able to contribute to feminist knowledge by addressing the underrepresentation of women in science and by pointing out the omission of their achievements from the history of science. While the content of biochemistry may be neutral, the political ideologies of her professors, initially as teachers, and later as colleagues, were not. As a graduate student in a politically liberal science department on a University of California campus, Christina boldly addressed the lack of attention to women in science by inviting women faculty to give presentations about women scientists. To counteract her female classmates' lack of self-confidence, she adapted women's movement's self-help and empowerment strategies, organizing car and bicycle repair workshops to enable her female classmates to feel stronger by acquiring skills traditionally limited to men:

> We had a couple of women professors come to talk to us. I also tried to form smaller subgroups modeled after the BWU (a socialist feminist union). We had a women mechanics subgroup that was the most successful one because there were women who worked on their cars and few that worked on their bikes. They actually liked getting together and working together. We were all overcommitted doing what we were doing—trying to do science.

As a newly hired young professor at a California State University, Christina felt she had to insert feminist content "under the table." In contrast to Rachel, who worked with sympathetic colleagues in a women's studies program, Christina worked with politically conservative men. In contrast to Irene's department's social science curriculum that, although it was established, had subject matter amenable to gendered content, Christina's curriculum was gender-neutral. Nonetheless, she told me, "I actually do inject when I can. I point out when there are women who did something important. I talk about Rosalind Franklin and other women. I bring in other books." Tenure emboldened Christina:

> I ventured into doing a little bit of stuff in an interdisciplinary program with other women who were known to be feminists outside my department. I decided I wasn't going to get involved with another layer of male hierarchy.

Olivia taught printing skills in a community college. As in the case of Christina, the content of Olivia's work set the parameters of her ability to translate her feminist beliefs into practice. Ink and water did not lend themselves to remedying omissions in women's history and experiences, correcting patriarchal theoretical bias, or using a gendered analytical lens. Nonetheless, she found ways to inject feminist/humanist sensibilities into her training curriculum:

> I did very different work than they [other print teachers] did. They would teach printing by having students use the different tools in the box. It is an exercise that is called trapping, shrinking, and spreading. The challenge is to fit the red into the black, what you have to do photographically to make this happen. Instead of doing boxes and registration we would do these great designs. The way the other print teachers did this was very rigid. I worked with this woman poet and we published poetry and had it illustrated. Those were our exercises. I was doing design work, I was publishing. I used my class to do publishing. We combined the letterpress and the offset press and

111

the design work. It was great. We did the haikus and then I would come back four weeks later. They would be up on the walls and everybody would have designed something different and then we would go around and they would explain and I would chose the ones I liked and we would publish them. It was just brilliant.

Advocating for Women's Rights and Issues: Feminists in Female-Segregated Jobs

In contrast to my feminist academic respondents, who could translate their

beliefs into practice as part of their jobs, my respondents in staff positions could not.

They were subject to close supervision, and their time was structured in fixed and

routine job responsibilities involving little discretionary judgment. They were able to

translate their feminist beliefs into practice only during breaks, at lunchtime, after

working hours, or on the weekends. Although my respondents had gone from one

women-only environment in the women's movement to another, this time it was not

by choice, but rather by male-designed and enforced segregation. Secretaries, clerical

workers, and office managers' job responsibilities did not require self-direction or

self-defined agendas. Quite the opposite. Staff provided faculty and administration

with technical and administrative support as part of a clerical pool or as assigned to

an individual, high-status manager. Although the duties and constraints of their jobs

did not give staff the latitude that academic feminists had to translate their feminist

beliefs into practice on the job, the existence of campus unions opened up possible

avenues for feminist political action. Berkeley's synergy of time and place in the '60s

had awakened Meredith's and Rebecca's political consciousness. Rebecca explained:

> I felt like the civil rights and the women's movement were stirring up stuff
> underneath that was not only making it possible for us to organize, but it was

making it sort of imperative. We had to have a vehicle through which to challenge the inequities in our society. . . . I can't explain to you why that day I read the personal ads, but one of the personal ads was, "Do you work on campus? Are you interested in forming a union for people who work on campus?" I thought, "What a great idea!" I went to the meeting place on the day specified and I met the seven or eight women who were there. . . . They were almost all women. They had the same reaction I had. We needed structure. So we launched this plan to get a union for non-academic staff on campus. We worked hard for several months and every time we had a meeting, it got bigger. We got in touch with a bunch of unions and we finally decided to affiliate with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. We were chartered as a local in the April of that year. There were forty-seven of us. By the end of two years, we had eight hundred members.

Meredith and Rebecca used their free time during breaks, at lunch, and after hours to translate their feminist beliefs into practice in the workplace. Together with other women, they established the first-ever women's union on a University of California campus. The union became a platform for raising awareness and making demands about women's rights and issues.

Rebecca's and Meredith's interests in unions stemmed from their parents, who were Communist Party members. Both women had joined the Party as young women and had remained in the Party into the '60s and later. The Party's orientation towards labor and towards unions influenced their positive responses to the call for a union of women and their subsequent decisions to join the union's executive organizing committee. Their Communist Party affiliations also influenced their initial distance from the burgeoning women's movement. Class was more critical than gender to them. In contrast to '60s radical, Marxist and socialist feminist women's movement critiques that demanded transformation of the nuclear family, of gendered social

113

relations, and an end to patriarchal culture, Rebecca's, Meredith's, and their union

sisters' initial demands stayed within the union framework of workers' rights and

"bread and butter economic" issues. Rebecca told me that initially she thought that

women's union's issues were same as traditional union issues. The only difference

was the women's union specifically reached out to recruit women, not men:

> [In the beginning] we would put out a flyer in a building where one of the
> women who had come to us with a grievance. The grievance might not have
> to do with the fact that they were women. It could be anything—vacation pay,
> sick leave, or overtime. You name it, the university was wrong.

Neither Rebecca nor Meredith participated in the San Francisco Bay Area

117workplace with other women in close enough proximity to allow casual

conversation was sufficient to develop a sense of solidarity and raise feminist

awareness. Rebecca explained her reasoning:

> I didn't feel the need to join a women's group. I was too busy, I worked forty
> hours per week and then went to Communist Party meetings. There are no
> guys around [at work], so you make friends and sometimes you do stuff with
> them. We could talk during the day and be together outside socially. I think a
> lot of the same things were discussed, but not as methodically as it would be
> in a consciousness-raising group.

However, over time, the two became interested in the women's movement. "It

[the women's movement] was in the air." Rebecca's and Meredith's contributions to

the production of feminist knowledge was their ability to frame feminist issues in

ways that would appeal to and address union women's specific needs. Their

contributions would ultimately modify the union's demands, its actions, and its

outreach efforts. Now the union could reach women of color, the student movement,

the campus-based women's movement, and older Communist Party women.

As union leaders, their efforts to develop oppositional gender consciousness in the union evolved through a series of distinct steps.26 They rejected the traditional union perspective that regarded workers as a generic category. Their first step was to urge the union's Executive Committee to regard women not just as workers, but as women workers, whose conditions, experiences, and grievances were not always the same as men's. The two leaders made the feminist demand for equal pay for women relevant to their union members. They compared national women's movement data on gender-based wage disparities to their union's wage statistics. Seeing parallels, Rebecca and Meredith convinced the union's Executive Committee to demand that the university's management redress gender-based inequalities in rights and compensation.

The second step that Rebecca and Meredith took was to persuade the women's union's Executive Committee to add women-specific demands for changes in management rules. Rebecca explained:

> As workers, we were women and we were women workers and so from the very beginning one of the things our demands included was on-site childcare. We represented working women who had either spent practically all the money they earned to pay for childcare, or had to worry about their kids because they didn't think they were in safe situations, or they had to travel long distances before the workday even began to deliver their kids to childcare and then to come to work. We said there should be on-site childcare, free on-site childcare for staff, that was something the university should provide. It seems very Pollyanna-ish now but at the time we thought it was a totally righteous demand.

Rebecca and Meredith convinced the Executive Committee to get union members to agree to challenge the management's mandatory dress code for clerical workers. This

code required female employees in the front office, who were visible to the public, to

wear nylon stockings and dresses while female employees out of public sight in the

back office could wear pants. Meredith provided the specifics:

> There was a dress code issue that became a grievance at one of the
> university's research institutes. We wanted to wear pants. We had a really
> liberal office manager. She was great but just was physically more able to do
> her job because was more comfortable wearing pants. The dress code was that
> you were expected to look like you worked in the business world if you met
> the public. At UC, most women didn't wear pants to work. You were
> supposed to wear skirts, stockings, heels, all of that. If you were like me and
> some of the people on the staff where you had no public contact, you sort of
> could wear anything. Nobody cared. It was such a double standard. Ten years
> ago [2005] we got language in our contract that refers to fair and respectful
> treatment. That made dress code a grievable issue. . . . That was not a typical
> union issue.

The third step that Rebecca and Meredith took was to urge the Executive

Committee to seek union members' approval to support activist women's groups

outside of their workplace. This action signaled that the union now recognized that

union women, as women, had shared experiences of subordination and inequality

with other women. In some instances, the union became part of a broad coalition for

women's reproductive and abortion rights that included the needs of women of color.

Rebecca's and Meredith's success in getting the union to support women's advocacy

groups meant that union women now understood the importance of solidarity with

other women, not just with campus coworkers.

The fourth and final step involved applying a gendered lens to general

political issues affecting both men and women. To support resistance to the Vietnam

War, Rebecca and Meredith convinced the union's Executive Committee to get union

116

to approve a campaign to raise funds to send Vietnamese women penicillin to combat venereal disease caused by forced prostitution with American soldiers. This step broadened the antiwar movement's message by raising women's movement issues about women's health, violence against women, and women as collateral war damage.

In contrast to my respondents in predominantly male academic jobs or in female-segregated staff positions, my independent professional and movement/day job respondents had more freedom to develop feminist knowledge than their counterparts who faced bureaucratic and management constraints. These women contributed to feminist knowledge by bringing a critical lens to examine topics ignored by the mainstream. As part of her work as an employment lawyer on "the plaintiff's side," Diane did pioneering work for what would become sexual harassment legislation. "We were handling and talking about sexual harassment cases long before sexual harassment had a name." Barbara, the independent artist and sculptor, fashioned cake sculptures out of clay caricaturing famous women—a Barbara Bush cake decorated with pearls and a Bella Abzug cake decorated with a large hat. Lynn, the photographer, specialized in chronicling everyday lesbian lives hidden from view. Trudy was a columnist writing articles about working-class women's issues for a movement newspaper.

Challenging Organizational Hierarchies and Fighting for Equality

When my respondents left the women's movement to work in bureaucratic organizations, they went from flat to hierarchal structures; from consensus decision-

making to top-down authority; from flexible jobs based on balancing workers' interests and skills against the collective's goals to rigid job classifications subordinating workers' skills and management's needs. My respondents tried to maintain their feminist beliefs about democratic decision-making, cooperation, equal and humanistic social relations, and equal compensation. But their bureaucratic workplaces required them to confront organizational structures and management ideology antithetical to their feminist beliefs and practices. Their challenge was to find the best ways to succeed in these settings, navigating their work environments when their feminist beliefs and practices were at odds with their organizations' dominant values and practices.

For my respondents in predominantly male academic positions, administrative duties as faculty, advisors, department chairs, or project directors and their teaching responsibilities gave them two different arenas for translating their beliefs into practice. In what follows, I first discuss my respondents in predominantly male occupations' administrative oppositional gender practices in one-to-one meetings with superiors, in group settings, and in one-to one interactions with subordinates. I then turn to my respondents' practices in the classroom.

Rachel inverted and subverted the university's traditional hierarchical authority structure in her individual interactions with superiors. The Women's Studies Program shared her values and supported her actions:

> The students were my bosses, that is what I felt and they made me feel that. I got hired by a group of fifty women who were students on the hiring committee. The program had a student-run board which made all the

decisions. Students also taught classes, ran the office, and had a women's center.

She chuckled when she told me about her meeting, as a program coordinator, with a university administrator:

> I remember going into a meeting at one point with twenty students. He asked, "What are you all doing here?" "Well," I told him, "the Women's Studies board is made up of students and they help make the decisions, so we are here." He said, "I only want to talk to the coordinator." So finally, after arguing with him, he let me go into his office. I said I was not entitled to make any decisions. So every time he tried to get me to make a decision, I said, "I have to go outside and talk to the board because they are the ones who make the decisions." He was just livid. I kept going back and consulting and coming back. He didn't fire me. We won.

Olivia, as department chair, accepted and used her authority as chair to empower her students to create a student-run alternative hierarchy inside the university that she jokingly called "an offshore operation." Her students applied their classroom learning, circumvented established channels, exercised self-determination, and brought in resources for their own benefit. Olivia credits her mentor, the founder of a soup kitchen where she volunteered for decades, for her strategy:

> When I became department chair at the college, I brought that [her volunteer job in the soup kitchen] into my work. It was subtle. Even handling money. It came more from her [the soup kitchen founder]. I remember thinking that everything I do, I learned from how we worked in the kitchen. There was a way to include people and to engage them in the sense that there was enough to go around. We would sell our own textbooks. We didn't go through the campus bookstore. It was sort of a subculture. We used it for educational purposes. We didn't use it for ourselves. We sold them right out of our office. We got them from our press. Students bought them from us. We also sold business cards to City College people. I had a way of bringing in a lot of resources into the department. Why require students to put more money into the bookstore?

In contrast to Rachel and Olivia, Irene, as department chair, ran faculty meetings using her New Left/ feminist beliefs about cooperation and equality as her guide. Her practices with faculty in department meetings stood midway between the radical and conservative ends of the oppositional hierarchical gender practices continuum. She accepted elements of her formal authority—holding onto privileged information and making final decisions—but she modified others. She used her authority to introduce feminist-inspired practices to soften the top-down nature of her chair role. She encouraged more faculty interaction, cooperation, and input into department decision-making (see section below: "Building Solidarity and Islands of Community and Care"). Her goal was to democratize department meetings. "I was department chair for eight years. I ran the department differently than the way the men run the department. I just ran it more democratically, more on principle, in a less authoritarian way."

Carol also kept and relinquished elements of her authority in her group meetings with staff. As director of her own extramurally funded university project under the financial, but not the administrative, aegis of the university, Carol had more latitude than Irene to set the terms of her institutional arrangements. She accepted that she had the final say and was accountable to the university, but unlike Irene, she relinquished two components of her authority in her frequent staff meetings—holding onto privileged information and being the sole person responsible for decisions. She also inverted hierarchical roles and did secretarial tasks such as minute-taking at

project meetings. She did this because she wanted to demonstrate that she wasn't

above such tasks and because it helped her know what was going on:

> I felt like the women's movement is where these ideas came from of collaborative work and a different style of inclusiveness. It was not making a hierarchy of who could be in control and it was honoring, on the one hand, that I was in control and that on the other hand, I wasn't the only person is control. That everybody's voice counted. I thought they cared about knowing all these details. . . . I thought about staff continuity. I had a hard time thinking of myself as an authority figure to people who I employed. . . . I was doing something that was clearly collaborative, but I was their boss. I shared the budget and evaluations with all of them. We had a meeting every week where we talked about everything we were doing including the highest level to the lowest level, the administrative staff, though they were not the lowest in terms of what needed to be done. I had students participating in discussions about the direction of the project. I always felt I had to privilege the project and the end point of the project, which was collaborative, rather than to focus on myself. I was there to nurture it and keep it going.

To translate their beliefs about equality with staff, Rachel and Olivia modified

staff positions. When Rachel served as the Women's Studies director, she spread

responsibility among her staff for the fledging Women's Studies Program. "The job is

too much for one person and I wanted more free time." She divided her full-time

coordinator position into two part-time positions and gave half of her salary to a

codirector. Olivia recognized the expertise of her staff. She invited her secretary to

join her as an equal on a project where she was qualified, not by university's

stipulated educational credentials, but by virtue of her experience:

> We really worked as a team. She had her job and I had mine, but there was a project that we worked on together and so that is how we broke through some of the barriers. We took on a project and we did it together. It was working with incarcerated youth because she had been an incarcerated youth and I had an incarcerated youth degree. We had a lot in common and it was something we shared. It leveled the playing field for us. She didn't have any discomfort about her role and she was very good at it.

121

My respondents' interactions with their secretaries as part of their administrative responsibilities provided another opportunity for them to translate their beliefs about equality into practice. They opposed the dominant culture's privileging of mental over manual labor. Their practices varied according to the extent each took responsibility for their own clerical work. Rachel objected to the lack of respect given to secretaries, and to their low pay. She regarded them as potential allies. Their proximity to management made them useful as source of information about management:

> I had difficulty asking secretaries to do my xeroxing. There's important things that secretaries do and need to do and we need to have them. We need to have people in the office to answer questions and direct people where they need to go. They need to be respected, that is the difference, not that you have to do everything yourself. You respect the person who helps you by doing a lot of the things yourself and you make sure that the person gets properly reimbursed. I knew to be close to all the secretaries.

Olivia would have liked to increase her secretary's pay and reclassify her position, but she did not control personnel matters and Human Resources refused. By contrast, Carol had the freedom to adjust salaries because she wrote the budget for extramural funding. She took it upon herself to redress unequal compensation. "I gave up a portion of my salary allocated in the budget to raise other people's."

Diane, the lawyer, went further than Carol and Rachel by avoiding the one-to-one superior/subordinate, supervisor/secretary relationship altogether. Avoiding hierarchical relationships was part of her decision to become an independent professional and to work outside the mainstream, first in legal collective, and then in her own solo legal practice:

I don't have anybody working for me. I did everything. I am pretty functional. I know how to put money in the bank and pay the bills. I work in a suite and the rest of the suite is the jury project. They are friends. I stay small so I don't have to hire anyone and pay them a salary. I do my own secretarial work, unless it gets too big. But mostly I do it all. I don't like to have other people do my stuff.

Classrooms offered another arena for my academic respondents with teaching responsibilities. Their pedagogical practices varied according to the ways each involved their students in curriculum design, in the techniques they used to present content, and in how they handled evaluation and grading. Rachel's classroom was an example of the most complete adoption of feminist pedagogy. Her ability to use these methods was possible because the Women's Studies Program was new and not yet institutionalized, and, as a consequence, somewhat removed from the university's direct oversight. Moreover, her department was sympathetic to her beliefs. The values underlying her department's decision-making strategies and allocation of faculty assignments could easily be extended and applied to her pedagogic intentions:

> My department was very democratic. We [the lecturers, the tenure-track faculty, and the chair] made decisions together. We would look at the schedules together. We would say, "Oh, well, how about I'll do it [sign up for an inconvenient schedule] and you do it next semester. You know, I will do a semester of sacrifice." The lecturers had a vote. We all helped structure the curriculum. We all sat around and discussed study until we agreed. That is what we used to do.

Her commitment to a democratic and participatory relationship with her students was based on principle.

> [My classroom would] not be part of the system that convinces people they are stupid and oppresses people. I was trying to help them [her students] feel smart, give them the tools that they would need, but see them as tools, not the proper way to do it. I tried not to talk down to them.

123

To this end, Rachel rejected the authoritative voice, did not stand behind a lectern on a raised platform, encouraged discussion, and saw evaluation not as a stamp of approval or disapproval, but as a process that utilized peer input. She created a contract between herself and her students. Her syllabus was an agreement between two parties to assure mutual accountability:

> I used feminist pedagogic techniques, a lot of discussion, and peer editing of essays. We all sat in a circle. I didn't use a red pencil and gave points instead of grades. I made an agenda about what we were going to talk about. The students agreed to it. It became sort of a contract. I didn't lecture very much. My students were adamant about my not lecturing. I take very seriously sticking to a syllabus because I think if you don't, then you are breaking your agreement with your students.

Rachel reduced the professional distance between herself and her students by opening up about her personal life. "I would come out as a lesbian around the ninth week of a sixteen-week semester by inviting my lesbian friends to be on a panel and talk about lesbianism." Outside the classroom, she blurred the boundaries between experts and friends. "I would spend the night at various students' houses. I had a long commute to work. They would put me up. I got to know their friends and their families."

Established precedents and intractable content prevented Irene, Christina, and Olivia from incorporating feminist pedagogy into their classrooms. Although Irene's social content lent itself to Rachel-style pedagogy, her working conditions as part of an established, large department with an established curriculum and culture constrained her. Nonetheless, she told me, "I didn't just stand there and lecture. I tried to be more interactive." Christina and Olivia's disciplines depended upon laboratory, hands-on instruction and experiments. Teacher/student discussions and student-

124

centered curriculum common in seminars and classrooms were not part of the science curriculum after the students' first year.

Feminists in movement/day jobs and independent professionals avoided dealing with hierarchy by their very choice not to take mainstream jobs. They were motivated by their dislike of authority and an unwillingness to conform and by their rejection of the capitalist value of competition. Climbing ladders, hierarchies, and having bureaucratic power over others was not an issue. These feminist activists stood outside the system. Having a mainstream career was not important to them. Their primary commitment was to the movement. Diane, who had a solo legal practice, put it this way: "Ladders? Well, not in the environment I am in. I am the boss. I put myself outside ladders and promotions. I come from an era of law collectives. I acquired that point of view."

Dealing with Work and Family Balance

My respondents' decisions to enter the workforce, to earn money, and to pursue a career challenged the then dominant metanarrative that women should remain at home and find satisfaction as mothers and housewives. Wanting to work, yet still primarily responsible for child-rearing, my respondents faced an intractable dilemma, what Oakley calls "structural ambiguity"—success in one arena results in defeat in the other (Oakley 1974). Carol's dream captures the consequences of the worst-case scenario— having a child means sacrificing one's career:

> I actually had a dream when Elizabeth was a baby girl that we were sitting on a little desk chair and she was on my lap and the water was getting higher and higher. I thought we going to drown and I didn't know what to do and I kept

lifting her higher and putting my head up and then I turned around and there was land next to me, right next to me that I hadn't noticed and I quickly got off the chair and put her on the ground and scrambled myself onto the land and watched my desk go down the river.

Soon after graduating, Christina became aware of the consequences her workplace's culture and institutional arrangements exacted. "I had my first baby when I had a post-doctoral fellowship. I called [the university's human resources department] and was told, 'There is no maternity leave.'"

My respondents' challenge became how to meet competing responsibilities to their jobs and to their families. For my academic respondents, this dilemma was the result of contradictory demands. On the one hand, to advance in their careers they had to present themselves as able to move geographically, since the academic marketplace was nationwide. On the other, to be good parents, they wanted to stay in place to assure family stability for their school-age children. Two of my respondents' choices represent extremes. Carol chose her family over her career: "I wanted a continuous community for my children." Christina, in contrast to Carol, chose ambition over a relationship with a fellow graduate student. She told me that she stopped seeing him because she didn't want to be in a relationship where she "tagged along," was "second fiddle," or was "dependent on what he decided."

The flexibility in an academic's on-campus working hours and the ability to work at home added to an academic mother's difficulties. Irene told me, "One reason I became an academic was so that I could have more flexibility in terms of raising my daughter, being with her when I needed to be." However, ambiguous academic

126

performance criteria and publishing pressures imposed limits on that advantage. For Carol, "I could have published a million articles, but I didn't do that. I wanted to be with my family." One of the few women scientists on Christina's campus told a group of female graduate students her solution. According to Christina, *"She told us to all not to have children until we had tenure so that we could be one of the men. I remember that very well."*

None of my respondents in higher education jobs followed this female scientist's advice. Instead, they translated their feminist beliefs that "women should/could have it all" by devising oppositional gender workplace practices to work around family/work balance issues in settings ideologically and structurally unfriendly to women and families. These strategies included hiding the fact they had children, converting their workplace into a child-friendly zone, or opting for a middle path by settling for a work-around of seeking jobs with scheduling flexibility and performance standards at a level compatible with family life. Christina was covered at work. She hid the fact that she had children. The theme of a divided self between work on the one hand and family and community on the other was a recurrent thread throughout her narrative. She was "a pretty out-there person" in her private life with family and community. Describing her job interview for her current position, she told me that she concealed her feminist politics and her motherhood. She did this to preempt the patriarchal assumption that being married and having a child would make her an undesirable colleague because her loyalties would be divided and, her absence from work to take care of her sick child would make her unreliable. To eliminate this

127

negative assessment, she omitted and deflected questions about her marital and family status:

> I didn't tell them I was married. I wasn't. I didn't tell them I had a kid. I didn't put anything at the top of my vita about my personal life. I put my name, my address. So if they wanted to know, they had to ask and I think I might have gotten a job offer at a school we'll leave unnamed in a desirable town in Oregon except at dinner that night they had a faculty dinner for me which was very nice and the wine was flowing and they started asking me about my personal life and I had practiced because I didn't want to say, "I have a child and I refuse to get married." I didn't want to say that. So I had practiced. The idea was they would say "Are you married?" And I would say, "We have a child." I tried to do it so I wouldn't say that I wasn't married, but I did say we had a child and my partner was able to move if he liked the place.

Once hired at her current job, Christina's worst fears were confirmed. "There were people who wouldn't speak to me when they found out I was pregnant [with my second child]. I am sure they thought, 'There goes another one.'"

By contrast, Carol's practice was to be completely open about being a mother. She took her daughter with her to conferences and converted her workplace into a family-friendly oasis: "We would do our grant proposals very late at night. I was very pregnant at the time and people would bring me food and make me nap. It was very sweet. There were lots of people around, standing room. I was very pregnant."

Olivia's practice, like Carol's, was to blur the boundaries between family and work. As department chair, she permitted her employee, a new mother, to bring her baby to work and to place her in a blanket-lined box next to her. "The baby brought pleasure to us all, that is, until the chancellor got wind of this violation and forbade this practice."

In addition, Olivia and Christina also adopted work-around practices. They accepted the constraints of a workplace unfriendly to women and families but found ways to operate within its existing parameters. Olivia chose jobs that gave her the flexibility she needed as a mother. Christina "took a post-doc to get out of the line of fire and to be able to stay in the Bay Area for my children." She went on to say, "By the fact that I stayed in Berkeley in these different capacities [teaching and research], I wasn't in direct competition with my colleagues."

In contrast to my respondents in predominantly male academic jobs, the mothers I interviewed in female-segregated jobs did not face the same structural tensions or have to make trade-offs between work and family responsibilities. Part-time jobs were possible to get. Clerical and administrative workers were not routinely expected to take work home. Meredith told me, "The best job I had was being the receptionist in the office of the campus marching band. My work paralleled the school year. I could be available to my kids in the summer." In contrast to Christina, who began in March to find summer activities for her children because she used summer to do her research, Mary, a high school teacher, said, "Well, one of the wonderful things about teaching was that when I was at work I was at work, and when I was at home I was at home. I drew very strong lines."

Creating Solidarity and Community in the Workplace

When my respondents moved away from intense involvement in the women's movement to work in bureaucratic organizations, they left behind the company of like-minded women with community-oriented values and practices. They found

layers of hierarchy, externally imposed discipline, and tacit acceptance of professional norms that replaced the emotional glue of solidarity. Carol's words reflect many of my respondents' general sentiments about what had been lost: "I had this subculture that were people who understood me and I understood them for the first time in my life. I loved the feeling of being in women's groups, the level of understanding and the accepted priorities."

They also had to deal with their status as the only woman and an alien workplace culture. Olivia explained. "As the only woman, I had to really push back and push hard against these guys to maintain a place for myself in the department. I had to assert myself and put my stake in the ground." Diane, a lawyer, felt conflicted and put off by the dissonance between her approach to mediate legal issues between contending parties rather than to fight to win. She believed that "the law is male-dominated in its thinking. It gives you points for being aggressive as opposed to being reasonable. As a lawyer, there is always a right and wrong, as opposed to let's look at the complexity." As department chair, Olivia had to deal with university administration and suppress her emotions. instead of speaking freely and "duking it out" with heated discussions among political comrades as she once had.

> We had a meeting with this really asshole vice chancellor and I am wondering what is going to happen when he behaves like an asshole. Can you get up and flip him off and leave? It is such a hierarchical structure. You can't do that.

In contrast to my academic respondents, those in female-segregated jobs found comfort and solidarity in a female-segregated workplace. However, as members of the first campus union, Rebecca and Meredith encountered opposition

not only from management, but also from other campus unions made up of mostly

men. "The administration was very intransigent. We called them [campus department

hierarchies] Mansion Services Organizations—a white chair, a white manager, and

black clerical staff." Local and national male union officials also stood in their way.

Meredith told me about her difficulties with other campus unions and with the

national union they were affiliated with:

> They [other campus unions] not only did not want to us to get going and get some power, but they didn't want other unions to be on campus either. We had to fight to get the unions to get bargaining status, to have elections, to negotiate a contract, and they are still resisting.

> They [their national central office] felt we were too independent. They called us ballbusters. We spent the last fourteen years fighting our union and not getting anything. They take our money and don't give us nothing. We always talked about the men in Washington as "suits." We used to say, "Let's go to meet with the suits." My best friend who was also in the union and I got called lesbians by the suits in Washington because we were inseparable.

To counter these kinds of obstacles, my respondents carved out, depending on

their particular institutional opportunities and constraints, oppositional gender

practices that I call "islands of community and care." These islands, similar to Evans

and Boyte's "free spaces," represented my respondents' responses to the tensions they

experienced between bureaucratic, instrumental rationality and the feminine ethos and

practices of caring work they had learned growing up. These islands allowed my

respondents in predominantly male and female-segregated jobs to both temporarily

escape unwelcoming environments, hierarchical control, and their outsider or second-

class status. In these spaces, my respondents were able to model solidarity practices,

to voice their oppositional thoughts, and, when the need or external factors arose, to

launch collective actions. These examples varied according to the types of jobs my respondents had, according to where and when they took place, according to their purposes, and according to the kinds of interactions that happened.

Christina and Carol took advantage of two different kinds of institutional arrangements that allowed them to escape an unwelcome environment and direct hierarchical oversight—interdisciplinary programs and extramurally funded projects. Emboldened after she was awarded tenure, Christina reached out to feminist scholars in other campus departments and agreed to co-teach a course about women in science fiction in an interdisciplinary course that took place in a building far from her department, allowing her to minimize contact with her colleagues. She was able to develop critical feminist content, experience shared work with other women, and do all this as part of her job during her working hours: "I decided I was going to teach it with feminist women period. I was not going to add another stratum of men to deal with on a daily basis. I did think it allowed me to be more of myself on campus."

Carol found that her work as a project director with an off-campus office and extramural funding, reporting to a sympathetic tenured principal investigator, gave her considerable freedom to create an island of care and community. Her actions were motivated not only by her commitment to humane interactions in the workplace, but because she depended on volunteer staff. Emotional glue rather than money helped with staff retention:

> I did make it [her small, off-campus office suite] a home. I bring bagels and baguettes every day. There wasn't an intern that I didn't take out to lunch even if I would never have seen them again after the semester was over. We

used to have parties for everybody. We were a community. It was a big deal every single day.

As department chair, Irene used her authority to introduce feminist-inspired, community-building practices into department meetings. She did this to strengthen faculty cooperation:

> I ran them more interactively, but structured them so that people could talk or were asked to talk about certain issues. First of all, I structured them so that people talked about what they were doing and so they would get to know each other instead of just doing department business. I even structured them when at one point there was a lot of conflict. We had a ritual. "Ok, tell me something you appreciate about your colleagues." I once had a meeting where one of the former chairs started to cry. People started feeling better about each other. It is very easy in an academic setting to just keep your nose to the grindstone. There is not much attention to social relations or how people are working together or not much acknowledgement. recognition for productivity or for cooperation and knowing each other as human beings.

Away from their home institutions, my academic and independent professional respondents participated in women's caucuses within their local and national professional associations or in independent professional women's associations. The women's caucuses or sections existed to promote the visibility of women in the professions and to create a community of potential research collaborators. Irene told me, "I belonged to Sociologists for Women in Society. My research is all about women. All my friends consider themselves feminists. I just take it for granted it's part of what you do." Christina was a member of the Association for Women in Science. Artist/sculptor Barbara joined the National Women's Caucus for the Arts. She proudly told me, "I was active and showed my work. I was also in the Pacific Women's Sculptor's Group and in a group called No Limits for Women's

133

Artists for about ten years." These groups provided an alternative collective setting for my respondents that compensated for the isolation they felt as the only woman in their home institutions or working as independent professionals. These groups facilitated the creation of feminist identity and a sense of solidarity that empowered my respondents to advocate collectively for remedies for the underrepresentation of women and the lack of recognition of their work.

In contrast to my respondents in academic jobs, those in female-segregated K–12 or in clerical positions could not, apart from their breaks and lunch hours, create free spaces for solidarity or advocacy as part of their jobs during working hours. Instead, they used after-work hours and weekend times in the community. They created three different organizational forms: projects linked to but outside the workplace, alternative institutions, and social networks. Molly, the high school teacher, was a part of an independent radical teacher's project that met weekly after school in the evenings or on weekends. The project's goal was to remedy the absence of a peace-oriented curriculum in East Bay public high schools. Although the project was not authorized by the East Bay school district, the group's members were members of the district's teacher's union. They used the union as a vehicle to advocate for the incorporation of their curriculum into the East Bay public schools. A women's support group that lasted several years developed from this project.

Jane, a university administrator, Diane, a lawyer, and Olivia, a printer, were part of efforts to establish alternative institutions. In contrast to Mary's project, which met in participants' living rooms, each of these alternative institutions had a physical

site, a budget, and a small staff, and each provided services to a clientele. Jane told me about a feminist institute she had cofounded. "It was a place where feminist poets and artists who taught whatever their expertise was, for a fee, very modest fees." The institute morphed into monthly feminist study and reading groups that lasted for decades. Diane worked with other lesbian feminist lawyers to create a center for lesbian rights. Olivia was part of a soup kitchen founded by a Buddhist. She told me why she was so devoted to this project: "Every person has value. We all came out of the women's movement. We all came forward as women. We still have a mothers' group that still meets every other week. So I still have women I am very close with who are like community for me."

Semiformal social networks in the community also served as a way to create islands for those female-segregated and independent professional respondents not involved in workplace-related professional associations. Jane was a member of Free Agents of Berkeley (FAB), a network of community activists and independent artists and authors. Jane told me:

> They have this annual tea with silver urns. It is sort of a spoof on English high tea. The organizing groups brings goodies like scones or cookies and provides all the tea. Everybody comes and pays ten dollars. A single theme is chosen by the steering committee about an issue or theme to discuss.

Rachel relied on a social group based on her lesbian identity that met annually to socialize, share information, have educational workshops, and relish being together as lesbians:

> I have my friendship network. My home base is Old Lesbians Organizing for Change. You have to be sixty years old to join. They are old political dykes

between sixty and ninety years old. I adore them and I learn a lot from them. Group meetings are get-togethers where people go around the room getting everyone to participate and respond to questions, mostly feminist. Everyone gets to say their age. People applaud if you are older. They have meetings twice a year. We stay overnight and have workshops. All of us naked in the swimming pool with a lot of us enormously fat. All these naked bodies having a good time.

Trade-offs and Consequences

My respondents' decisions to translate their beliefs into oppositional workplace gender practices helped to retain their feminist identities, but that retention came at a price. Implementing oppositional practices within existing institutional arrangements, where the workplace culture did not support their beliefs, hampered their efforts to have a satisfactory work and family balance, to achieve professional recognition, to effectively do their jobs, and even to achieve their feminist objectives.

Christina and Olivia sacrificed interesting work and professional status in exchange for time with their families. Christina had three children and refused on principle to hire help ("I burned the candle at both ends"). Although she became a tenured professor, she didn't get the academic recognition she felt she deserved. Seven months pregnant, she was unable to fly to present the results of her pathbreaking dissertation research at her professional association's annual meeting. Her mentor, the co-author, made the presentation, and although Christina was acknowledged, she did not get the visibility or the networking opportunities she thought she needed. She was also frustrated in her research because she took a job at a state teaching university instead of a research university. Although she continued to

136

do research, she did this to have less pressure to publish and more time with her family. To the extent that she did research, it was at great cost:

> I was very frustrated research-wise. I did not have support institutionally. [My university] did not have the room in the building for a lab. It did not have the intellectual milieu. There was just so much lacking research-wise. . . . I worked for over twenty years of summers without pay to run my lab, to train my graduate students, to fix things, to order things, make things work, day after day, which meant that I was not home with my kids when they were home. So I would start at about March and I would line up summer activities for them that would fill up the whole summer since I couldn't be there.

For Olivia, who chose not to work overtime, so that she could be available to her young child, the consequences of this workplace arrangement included sacrificing status and pay and becoming ineligible for the interesting, better-paying jobs done on large presses. "I did a lot of stupid jobs," she told me, "like doing Kodax envelopes, like thousands, imprinting the red on them. I looked for jobs that didn't have overtime. I worked for people who allowed that kind of flexibility."

My respondents' anti-authoritarianism and their opposition to top-down hierarchy led to situations where they had to delegate authority while remaining accountable for outcomes. In the course of describing a project whose success resided in the staff and volunteers' talents and motivation, Carol recounted an incident that captures the consequences of this trade-off.

> I remember one situation in my old office. I decided that there was this couch in the office that was taking up too much room, and our office was so small, that I decided to take it out and put it in my office. It wasn't in the public space and one of the students wrote me a five-page letter about how rude I was to take the couch out without consulting. I had empowered him to do that. There was another woman who was always sitting in my chair when I came to the office and I would say, "Hello, that's my chair." She would say, "Why should it be your chair?"

Despite her feminist intentions, Olivia's effort to translate her commitment to equality into practice had the unintended, ironic consequence of turning her into an exploitative boss. Like Carol, she wanted to collaborate with rather than dominate her staff. She asked her secretary, who had been incarcerated as a young person, to join her as a colleague on a project serving incarcerated youth. However, the university's human resources department refused to upgrade the secretary's position, and so she wound up doing a higher level of work at her original, lower, rate of pay.

Olivia's interview for the position of college dean illustrates the consequences of her decision to toe the line and to divide her public self from her private actions. She had to straddle the fence and live in two worlds. Olivia didn't get the job. In part, Olivia attributes this rejection to her decision to wear the "purple suit."

> I had this purple linen suit that I thought was great until somebody said, "You have to lose it." I wore the suit to the interview with the chancellor for the job interview. It was an attempt at being formal, but it really wasn't. It was a jacket and pants. I don't remember it being terrible. I just wanted to be appropriate. Now, looking back, if someone comes into a dean's job, they have to know how to live in two worlds. You know what they say. You have to code-switch. The color and the fabric being linen, not tailored and pressed, it was somewhat femiknine and I had funky shoes on. The dean is some fat-assed guy with a huge belly. Maybe I should have worn a dress.

> My choosing to wear the purple suit was an overlap with my involvement with the soup kitchen. I was really straddling two worlds. One was the soup kitchen. Nobody in the soup kitchen works full-time or is in the working life, they are an anarchists, hippie, counterculture types. I had the other foot in [community college]. I have always been like that. So when I go to a job interview, my suit will be purple. I never really knew, I didn't wear gray or black.

In her '60s period, no public-private split existed. Then, the two were one. Olivia had used gender strategies to resist, hold on, and adapt as she tried to translate her

138

feminist beliefs into practices at work. Now she had come up against a "pink ceiling," where all that was purple would not be permitted.

Finally, my respondents' treatment of secretaries placed them in a double bind. Depending on the extent to which they took on secretaries' duties in the interests of equality, their workloads were increased. They still had to do their jobs for supervisors who expected the same level of productivity and same turnaround time.

I turn now to my respondents' narratives about their domestic lives.

CHAPTER 5. OPPOSITIONAL DOMESTIC GENDER PRACTICES

Chapter 4 described the oppositional gender practices my respondents developed in the workplace to balance their work and family responsibilities. I turn now to the other side of the coin—the private sphere of the family and the development of oppositional domestic gender consciousness and practices. To be able to enter the workplace, my respondents had to reject the traditional metanarrative that a woman's place is in the home and that she is the one primarily responsible for child-rearing and is dependent on her husband as the main breadwinner and head-of-household. The lack of affordable childcare made changes in the domestic sphere essential preconditions for my respondents to achieve their feminist workplace goals.

My respondents' challenges to domestic life targeted traditional customs of courtship, the ideal type of mate, the definition of marriage, the marriage ceremony, the organization of the family, and, finally, the household division of labor. These challenges would fundamentally affect the meanings of femininity, masculinity, and family. Moreover, these challenges threatened the metanarrative of heteronormativity, which tied sexual expression to reproduction and to the traditional nuclear family. As second-wave feminists, my respondents rejected societal expectations that women should stay chaste before marriage, that heterosexual marriage was the only path to happiness, and that women should stay at home and devote themselves to their husbands and to raising their children. My respondents insisted on being recognized for their minds as well as for their bodies. They demanded support from their partners for their right to have a career and to be independent. This support meant sharing

household labor and the responsibilities for child-rearing equally with their husbands or their partners. My lesbian respondents fought to end the stigma against same-sex sexuality. Diane told me about an experience she had at an overnight conference:

> They [conference organizers] assigned roommates. My roommate never came back to my room, to that shared room. At the time, I just thought they were out having a good time, it was not someone I knew, another woman. I think afterwards I thought, "Oh, I bet she didn't come back because she was afraid to sleep in the same room as me or something."

In the sections that follow, I describe my respondents' efforts to translate their beliefs about domesticity, sexuality, and intimacy into oppositional domestic gender practices intended to change the traditional conventions of courtship, marriage, family, and household arrangements. I present these efforts as my respondents' responses to dilemmas arising from the discrepancies between their feminist beliefs, the metanarrative about women's place, and their internalization of that narrative, in the context of the constraints and possibilities that their sexual preferences and their family and household arrangements imposed. I group my respondents' sexual preferences and household arrangements into four categories: (1) heterosexual or lesbian single-person households, (2) heterosexual married nuclear family households (3) heterosexual married or cohabiting communal households, and finally (4) lesbian cohabiting communal households. I make comparisons within and between these categories when relevant and conclude by discussing the consequences and trade-offs that stemmed from my respondents' efforts.

Courtship

By definition, my heterosexual respondents who wanted emotional intimacy and sex in their lives, and wished to have children, could not do so outside of long-term relationships with male partners. For these respondents, the challenge was to find emotional, trusting intimacy in unequal relationships. In the 1950s, heterosexual courtship required males to take the initiative, while females had to wait, protect their virginity, and "hold out" for marriage (Breines 1992). To navigate the tensions between their feminist beliefs and the realities of the situations they found themselves in, my respondents had to reevaluate their childhood socialization concerning appropriate sexual behavior, romantic love, and marriage. Barbara told me, "I never gave men a hard time. I was raised to be polite, to be very deferential, and to put my needs second, just like most females growing up in the '50s." Carol explained, "I thought the path to a good life was to be a faculty wife and to have children." Christina said, "I always assumed in college that I would get married… I grew up with this Cinderella fairy tale myth [that a prince would rescue and marry me]." The ideology of "romantic love"—young women "swept off their feet" by "knights in shining armor"—troubled Irene. "There were a lot of disconnects in my life. Even though my common sense knew things didn't work out that way. I was falling in love every week for a while." Should courtship behaviors be considered indications of male thoughtfulness or reinforcements of a woman's weakness and dependence? Irene reflected, "It was confusing about chivalrous things. Should a date open the door for you? Pull out a chair so you could sit down?" Olivia had to find her own

independent identity. How to be coupled and still be independent? She confessed she lost her independence in a couple relationship. "The man I was with became my story." Carol told me, "I had so merged with my boyfriend that when someone asked how I was, I would answer, 'We are fine.'"

Demanding to be regarded as an independent person in the workplace rather than as somebody's wife or as a sex object, yet still desiring intimate relationships, a family, and children, my heterosexual respondents were confused about how to represent themselves to potential mates. Olivia phrased her dilemma this way: "How can you be a woman, a feminist, be strong, and still be attractive to men? I didn't know how to be a feminist and feminine." Choosing not to remain chaste before marriage, my respondents wondered—given unequal power relations between men and women—whether the second-wave feminist demand that heterosexual woman have sexual freedom was viable in practice. Barbara's experiences with casual sex told her it was not. She had five unwanted pregnancies and five abortions because she "confused [her] need for nurturing with [her] desire for sex."

Within the lesbian community, my respondents questioned whether they wanted to reproduce heterosexual intimacy practices and traditional lesbian sexual practices, or to chart new lesbian feminist intimacy practices. According to Rachel:

> The discussion [about sexual practices] among the women's movement lesbians was between what we called, "old gay" and "new gay." We didn't even use the word lesbian that much then. Gay was the term we used. The old gay were the dykes who had been hanging out in the bars for years and had come out without a women's movement. New gays were the women who were coming out through the women's movement. We really had different perspectives on everything. We were critiquing masculineness. We didn't want to do male/female roles [like the "old gays"].

143

My heterosexual respondents had to address the dilemma of how to interpret patriarchal attitudes, behaviors, and institutionalized practices. Were men the enemy or was it the system? Although the media often portrayed feminists as "man-haters," In reality, my respondents' positions were complicated and contradictory. Ties to parents, siblings, colleagues, and friends, as well as pragmatic considerations, nuanced their views. Christina, a scientist in a predominantly male occupation, was also in a long-term heterosexual relationship and was the mother of three children. She resolved this dilemma by distinguishing between individual men and men as a group benefiting from a system that gave them dominance over women:

> For me, the split was when I was in the women's union. I saw real women-identified types. I saw women who were anti-men and I saw women who really—not that they were all one thing, but to varying levels, women-identified women. I could tell I wasn't there, that I wasn't one of them. I liked men too much. I liked individual men, but I did resent their privileges. How could I hate men? I wanted to be independent. I liked doing things with men and politically I liked living with men. I liked having a boyfriend. I really resented male privilege as it was evident in the men I interacted with. I was around men all the time. How could I not like men? I work with men after all. I was in a male field.

Mary, the school teacher who lived with her husband and son in a nuclear family household arrangement, was pragmatic. "If you are heterosexual and want to have a sex life, then to see men as the enemy doesn't really make sense." Rachel was the only one among my lesbian respondents who spoke to the question of whether men or the system were responsible for the patriarchy. Within the lesbian community, this question was framed as a debate over separatism. Should lesbians live completely apart from men? Rachel explained her position:

When I try to talk about feminism and separatism, I feel like somebody who had a lot of sympathy for separatism, but I was never a total separatist, but I had a lot of my heart in women-only spaces. I still believe that. The hard part was that I had this guy I cared about. I couldn't figure out how to keep him in my life, that it just was not okay, and the life I was entering, it was not okay to have this guy with me.

Distancing Practices

To protect their independence and autonomy, my heterosexual feminists used a range of distancing practices to fend off unwanted advances and chauvinist behaviors. Carol and Mary relied on verbal, face-to-face practices. **In public settings, Carol explained, "I could spot sexism in a minute. I was very allergic to it." She admitted she did "a very immature thing." (She wrinkled her nose and snorted, "Oink, Oink.")** She also used the practice of distraction to create distance. Her faculty advisor said his office was too hot and asked her to his apartment instead. Once there, as she recounted, "he put his hand on my thigh and, looking into my eyes, said, 'Something about you reminds me of Natasha.' At which point I took out these Soviet posters from Grove Press and said, 'How about looking at these women?'"

By contrast, Mary, already in a stable, married heterosexual relationship, was also direct, but less confrontational, in her face-to-face encounters. She pushed back, directly confronting her husband about behavior she considered sexist, and she also stepped back to put her husband's behavior in perspective:

When my husband does stuff that I think is misogynistic, I point that out. If I think he is being snide, condescending, or sarcastic, things which I feel are sometimes very male to keep himself in a powerful position and feeling better than me, I ask when I feel like I am being put down, humiliated, or not respected, I will look at what has happened. What's the behavior that makes

145

me feel this way? There are a hell of a lot of men out there today who act in a very oppressive ways to their wives and friends.

Insisting on physical and temporal space was another way to achieve emotional and psychological distance. Olivia refused to live with or share daily life with her long-term boyfriend, either at her house or his. Understanding that she had trouble maintaining her identity when she was intimately involved with a man, she set the terms:

> I wanted my own space. I didn't want to go over to his house. I wouldn't let him stay at mine. For him, I had to be either be part of his community or not. I didn't want to live there. I was hardly going to throw my lot in with a bunch of misogynist men. I was willing to participate with them. I did want my own space, not somebody else setting my agenda.

Avoiding contact with men altogether was another distancing practice. Like Olivia, Mary's life had focused on her boyfriend's moods. After their breakup, she wanted to give herself time to understand and change the way she felt and acted in intimate heterosexual relationships. She decided to live alone for five years without a serious relationship. She wanted to set her own agenda:

> **I began to realize that I could put myself at the center of my life. That was the difference. It was like there was an internal shift of inside me— putting myself in the center of my life instead of dancing around the outside of somebody else's moods. I was free. I was okay. . . . The five years of being alone helped me to understand what it meant to live with myself in a way where I wasn't depressed all the time.**

Lynn, a lesbian, proudly told me, "I didn't relate to men for ten years to get over my deferring habits." Christina, involved in an ongoing, committed heterosexual relationship, cohabiting and co-parenting with the father of her three children in a communal house, preserved her independence and autonomy by insisting she have

146

her own bedroom, so that sleeping together and having intimacy would be a matter of choice, not habit.

Choosing intimacy with unavailable men was yet another distancing practice. Jane, a heterosexual divorcée, never interested in remarrying, chose to have sex with married men to maintain her independence. "My goal is not to be aligned with men." Trust and mutual emotional attachment were not preconditions for her to become intimate.

> I love the idea of having a lover. I have had lots of lovers. Sex is different from marriage. It is romance and physical relief. I have given up the idea of being attracted to someone and having them be easy to live with. . . . Some of my lovers were married men, which made it safe for me. Married men, as you know, do what they want to do. It has nothing to do with their marriages most of the time. Most marriages are hard. You have to have a little pure joy on the side that doesn't mean anything. It is a release from responsibility of being a husband. It is just sex. Sometimes there is affection and sometimes there is more or less of it. It is fine with me. I am perfectly fine with that.

Three heterosexual women I interviewed chose to keep their distance from men by having intimate relationships with other women for a period of time. This practice offered the solidarity of being part of a women's community. Rachel explained:

> It was a lot of that kind of experimentation. [A lot] of women chose to be lesbian because they wanted to live their lives that way. In some ways, it is much more about someone who can relate to you more and really understand you more than most men were able to do. I feel like I really had a wonderful boyfriend, but there were still limits about what could happen.

Barbara was motivated by her need to heal from her negative heterosexual experiences in heterosexual relationships (including five abortions). To break out of her pattern of what she called "confusing nurturing with sex," she turned away from

147

men to begin a 12-year lesbian relationship, before deciding she wanted to have a

male partner again. She now cohabits with a man in a relationship that has lasted

more than 20 years. Barbara and her former lesbian partner remain close friends:

> I was angry. I think what happened was that I got so sick of my bad
> relationships with men that I got into a relationship with a woman. It was kind
> a surprise. We didn't do a lot of sexual stuff when I look back. In the first
> couple of years, yes, but then it sort of faded away which I think happens to a
> lot of women in relationships. We were all winging it together. It was pretty
> exciting. So it was a brave way to act out, but it was fun. And the things that
> was really great about it was that it was such a different kind of relationship.
> With men, my experience was that they wouldn't really talk to you. They had
> been trained to look at women as lesser beings. I was smart in other ways.

Sexual Expression: Heterosexual and Lesbian Respondents

My heterosexual respondents also challenged conventions about chastity

before marriage and the confines of monogamy in the nuclear family. They wanted to

explore the boundaries of sexual intimacy and to assert their independence and their

rights to sexual pleasure. Christina's upbringing had been "very traditional and

sexually repressed." Her mother frequently admonished her not to be a *"Mattress*

Mollie," a girl who slept around. The two engaged in what Christina called "the battle

of the hemline." Christina would go to school modestly dressed as her mother wished.

Once at school, she would stash her "below-the-knee" skirt in her locker and change

into more "fashionable," more attractive clothes. Christina's experience was similar

to that of several other respondents I interviewed:

> I grew up thinking that I wasn't going to have sex until after marriage. I spent
> so many years protecting my virginity. I really did. I was really brought up to
> be a good girl and to draw the line and to know where I was going to draw it.

Then I thought I would have sex with the person who I was going to marry—that was the normal trend—but I didn't think I was going to sleep around.

My heterosexual respondents' demands to enjoy sexual freedom challenged the links between chastity, romantic love, marriage, the nuclear family, and reproduction. For Carol as for Christina, sexual freedom meant rejecting the need to "protect her virginity" until marriage. Instead, she embraced the right to have casual sex unconnected to commitment or to marriage. Carol explained: "I didn't have a concept of sleeping around. We just did it. You just liked this person and you went with them. My husband now says, 'Was that one of your friends?' Probably, now, looking back we should have just been friends, but I liked that." Christina's story provides more details:

> I picked up men at this movement café/restaurant that had music and dancing, and spent the night with total, otherwise total, strangers, once in a while, yeah, not too many times. A couple of times I would go to these dances and meet men and I would usually flirt with men and go home. But once in a while I would meet a man I was interested in.

Making distinctions between sexual pleasures and romantic illusions was liberatory for Christina and Mary. Christina made this point by sharing rather than hiding the practical aspects of sex:

> I was with one man when I was still like fairly new to sex. He weirded out because I wanted to put my diaphragm in and I didn't think I should have to go to the bathroom to do it. I thought, "You should know what my body is." It totally freaked him out, so I didn't go out with him again. But I also probably went to the bathroom the next time, too. I believe that we were all inevitably confused, raised in the '50s to be good girls, good mothers, good wives, and then doing things in the '70s.

Years later, Mary persisted in this demystified approach to sexuality. In her 60s when I interviewed her, she was more interested in her health than romantic illusions. She insisted that she and her husband adopt sexual practices other than vaginal penetration:

> We're animals basically. We're human animals with a drive around reproduction. What happens to you physically [in menopause] is your vaginal tissues dry up. So you're on estrogen and these other fake hormones unless you beef yourself up with other things your body is not really meant to have intercourse. I don't buy into that I should take menopause medication. Outer sex is what one of my doctors calls it. In other words, there's intercourse and outercourse from a biological point of view.

More dramatically, my heterosexual respondents challenged the nuclear family's confines to explore their right to sexual pleasure outside marriage by experimenting with ways to "smash monogamy," as people said at the time. For Christina, "smashing monogamy" meant agreeing with her partner to explore affairs with the opposite sex and partner-swapping:

> We [my partner and I] didn't believe in monogamy. We practiced non-monogamy on purpose. We talked about it in our household and our group. I had one affair with a housemate along with this guy and it blew up. We were so intellectual about non-monogamy. We had met this other couple who were also anarchists. We liked them a lot and we actually met with them and made a proposal to switch partners to be non-monogamous. They went home and talked about it and decided no, that wasn't for them. We never did anything else that intentional and we did have this period where I was sleeping with this other man. I think non-monogamy is extremely hard to do well. It is easy to do if you are a jerk and you don't care, but if you are invested in the other person and other people's feelings, it is really hard to do well. I think we tried and when I was sleeping with this other housemate it was really hard on my boyfriend. It got to the point where I sort of had to chose between them and so I chose.

Trudy's husband asked her to agree to have an "open marriage" that would give each of them permission to have sex with other people. For Trudy, this meant sexual intimacy with other women. Her experimentation was short-lived. Their open marriage led to divorce. Trudy soon remarried and has remained in a monogamous relationship ever since.

For my respondents who had been attracted to women as young girls, the women's movement's valorization of relationships between women (see Chapter 3, "Becoming Women-Identified") gave them permission to acknowledge their sexual attractions to other women. Susan and Sarah told me that as teenagers in the '50s they had not understood or known how to act on their attractions to other women. Susan confessed, "I always had crushes and love affairs whenever I was not working myself to death. All we ever did [in college] was sleep in each other's arms in bed." Sarah told me, "I even fell in love with a girl. She turned me down and she knew what was going on. I didn't. I was totally unaware of what I was doing."

Sarah's story about her encounter group experience illustrates how her "coming out" happened to her. Her group leader challenged participants. "You women, you are all talking about loving women (which is what we were doing in those days). You know what the logical conclusion of love is?" Sarah told me, "I had a flash of insight. Oh shit! A light bulb went off! I realized I had it in me all along." Lynn told me, "I couldn't imagine kissing a woman. But then it happened. I declared myself a lesbian the next day! I called up my roommate and said, 'I am a lesbian.' And I was thrilled, I was so thrilled. I was ecstatic!"

"Coming out" prior to the '60s was harder for older lesbians than for my lesbian respondents who "came out" as part of their involvement in the women's movement. Rachel recalled, "I had a lover for a while who used to say, 'You were involved in the women's movement and then you came out. I came out and I crawled to the women's movement.'" Rachel explained that her lover was referring to a debate between the "old gays" who considered themselves "butch" (lesbians who adopted masculine-type behavior) and "new gays."

> The discussion [about sexual practices] among the women's movement lesbians was between what we called, "old gay" and "new gay." We didn't even use the word lesbian that much then. Gay was the term we used. The old gay were the dykes who had been hanging out in the bars for years and had come out without a women's movement. New gays were the women who were coming out through the women's movement. We really had different perspectives on everything. We were critiquing masculineness. We didn't want to do male/female roles [like the "old gays"].

Rachel explained, "Feminism brought the idea that there should be reciprocity." "New gays" criticized the stereotype of the lesbian butch as an emotionally withheld woman, believing that this was a performance that masked an alternative reality:

> Oh, you know, "Butch on the streets, femme between the sheets." Which is somebody that appears butch in the world, but in their home, she is not. Also, this concept [leads to] femmes bragging to each other about their ability to "flip a butch," as it was called, which is to reverse roles sexually, which was to get a butch to want her to initiate and to be the active one in the sex. Normally, a butch would do most of the sexual lovemaking to the fem. But the ability to flip a butch was embarrassing to the butch who allowed that to happen.

Revisioning Feminine Identity and the Ideal Type Mate

In the '50s, marriage and family were seen as opposed to careers for women. Growing up, women were not only pushed to marry, they were discouraged from

having an independent identity or from pursuing achievement in the outside world. Christina, a straight-A student in high school who would later become a university science professor, had to overcome her mother's stern warning, "You are going to be an old maid if you get a PhD." To attract a potential husband, it was thought that a woman must be delicate, submissive, maternal, and not smarter than the man she was dating. As my heterosexual feminists' involvement in the women's movement deepened, they saw the need to change their ideas about the desirable qualities a heterosexual woman needed to attract a male partner. Before she realized that she was a lesbian, Lynn told me that as a young woman she wanted boys to accept her:

> If you were a woman, and you were smart *and* athletic, that was just too much. So I gave up being athletic. It was a pretty conscious decision that I wasn't going to excel in sports. I did everything short of being dumb—or projecting myself as dumb. I wanted to be smart, and it was just going to be too much for people—that is, boys—to accept.

They also saw the need to change their vision of the ideal mate. They became disillusioned with their attraction to male "heavies" (as political leaders on the left were called). Irene revealed that: "For most of my time in the women's movement, I usually would be attracted to men who were these political leaders. They were egomaniacs and aggressive and outspoken and liked a lot of attention. I mistook that for some kind of strength."

Carol suffered a rude awakening, a consequence she attributed to being involved with a male heavy. Arrested and temporarily jailed for participating in a protest, she found herself next to a woman. Talking about her boyfriend, she soon realized that this woman claimed the same man as *her* boyfriend!

153

My respondents' revised visions of their ideal mate acknowledged differences

between men and women. Jane pointed to differences between male and female

capacities for empathy:

> I think most women are wider-angled, in the sense of not only knowledge that
> women are perfectly capable of doing, but because of the way we're put
> together, both physiologically, chemically, and psychologically, we have a
> wider angle than men tend to have. We often are able to see the various parts
> of living, and not everybody sees how they all integrate, but the empathy
> factor [that is key].

Irene agreed.

> I've never wanted as a feminist or woman to be more like men. I think men
> are really crippled and damaged emotionally. I wouldn't want to lose all the
> things that have been, all the social skills and social roles that have been
> assigned to women. I'd like to make men more like women instead of have
> women be more like men.

These experiences, coupled with the feminist demands that men share

household and child-raising responsibilities, pushed my feminists to replace their

desires for association with male heavies—which offered them vicarious status—with

desires for men who possessed a "struggle quotient." Mary explained the meaning of

this term:

> Part of the struggle is that you don't leave your man, you don't break up. You
> live together, you work together, you struggle through. I think my husband
> and I, we're more like eighty percent struggle, twenty percent connectedness.
> This idea that you are not always connected, that you don't always feel
> connected, that is a romantic myth that you marry someone and it is perfect
> from then on. It's in fact about a gender struggle and a class struggle, but it is
> how you live through those periods together, you raise the kids together and
> commit to each other when you are not feeling close, when you're feeling a
> certain level of loneliness.

154

Being with younger as opposed to slightly older men, who presumably were wiser, more in command, and more secure financially, was another criterion many of my heterosexual respondents adopted. At first, I was surprised to discover, but then quickly came to understand, my heterosexual feminists' predilection for younger men. Having younger men as partners offset the advantages that accrued to their partners from being male. Being older than their male partners allowed my respondents the respect and authority that comes with seniority. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, younger men were not as fixed in their male chauvinist attitudes. As teenagers, they had been exposed to feminism. This exposure meant these men were familiar with feminist ideas and open to adopting new attitudes and behaviors. Rebecca told me, "My husband is younger than me, like nine or ten years younger. He was an economics department teaching assistant. He seemed very hip to issues around gender." Carol's husband had socialist feminist theorist Sheila Rowbotham's *Woman's Consciousness, Man's World* tucked under his arm on their first date.

Instead of looking for men who were the strong, silent, and mysterious types, my heterosexual respondents told me that they now valued sensitivity, the ability to listen, and emotional openness. Carol's story parallels Rebecca's. She used the adjective "sweet" instead of "strong" to describe her partner's desirable qualities:

> Part of my attraction to my husband is that he was a little bit younger, five years younger. Those years were very critical in terms of male attitudes. Those younger guys were brought up with more feminist ideas. My generation of guys were still trying to deal with their "piggyness." The younger guys weren't formed. I fully believe it was very, very important to be with someone

155

who was with a slightly different generation. He was so incredibly sweet and feminist-oriented.

Barbara partnered with someone 13 years her junior. She used the terms "feminine," "tuned in," and "good listener" to describe her partner's positive attributes. Note, however, that she finds it difficult to accept that he is not taller than she is (a traditional desirable quality). Christina's vision of her ideal mate and the ideal relationship typifies many of my respondents' sentiments:

> I wanted a partner who imbued me, at first, I said independence, but then the man I lived with for a long time in the early '70s, had a way of putting hands together like that and saying, "This is how our dependence is. Neither is holding the other one up, but we're close. It's not like this one is holding this one up, but we're together in a kind of equality." I don't remember the exact words he used, but I always remember that. Because that's the way he and I wanted it to be.

If heterosexual feminists became disillusioned with "strength and power" as necessary qualities for their ideal partners, the lesbian feminists I interviewed did not. Rachel explained why:

> Lesbianism is about being a woman who is strong and has the qualities that men reserve for themselves. It was not good to be super femme, passive, and helpless. Being independent, strong and powerful and competent, that was good. I wanted to be handsome. That is the word I used to myself. Handsome means powerful, competent, and confident. For me, it meant shorter hair and dressing up more. I would wear a tailored shirt but open it up. It was fun, very fun.

Rachel was quick to add:

> We might have these qualities [strong, powerful and confident] too, but that doesn't mean we want to be men. There was a lot of stuff from the straight world that was saying to lesbians, "You just want to be a man. You envy men. That is your problem." Lesbians were responding, "No we don't want to be men. We are women. We like being women. We wanna be women."

156

Redefining Marriage and Marriage Rituals

In the '50s, getting married and having children was the socially acceptable path open to women. To her mother's disappointment, Christina chose to have a career and to cohabit rather than marry her long-term partner of 28 years, the father of her three children. Her mother had bought a handmade antique Belgian lace wedding veil on a trip to Europe when her daughters were young, in anticipation of future weddings. The veil remained in her closet, never worn:

> We broke her heart. Although I was a good girl and knew when to draw the line, I had a feisty streak that fit with what the women's movement was offering. I didn't want to be M R S. I wanted to be PhD. I didn't want to have the same zip code either [live near her parents].

Barbara, the daughter of wealthy parents, explained, "I was supposed to marry somebody, but not work. I was supposed to marry somebody who had gone to some Eastern school. I was supposed to play bridge, play tennis, be a member of a country club, and do the social thing. Be the little wifey shifey. Well, I had absolutely no interest in that."

The heterosexual women I interviewed questioned the idea of heterosexual marriage as a path to happiness. Jane told me, "When the topic of marriage comes up, I run in the opposite direction." My heterosexual respondents' views about marriage were influenced by their class backgrounds and the kinds of messages their parents transmitted about whom they should marry and why. For the two upper-class feminists that I interviewed, Barbara and Susan, marriage was about finding a man with the appropriate pedigree, who would augment family wealth and status. Susan

explained the process. "My parents very much laid on me that I had marry someone with a proper pedigree. The Service Bureau published a book that listed the eligible bachelors that the people who organized debut parties used."

For feminists like Trudy, who had middle-class parents, marriage was about finding an educated man with good earning potential, who would enhance their upward mobility and provide economic security. According to Trudy:

> You didn't want to be a coupon clipper, a rich person, and you didn't want to be a poor person because they didn't work. You wanted to be a person who worked. Of course, if you were a female, you wanted to be married to a person who worked. I was definitely raised with the idea that I would marry. We would go to college because that was where you would get a good husband and then if he died, you could teach. The goal was to be the wife of an educated man.

For my respondents with working-class parents, marriage meant finding a man who would bring home a paycheck. Meredith's mother told her that she should "marry a man who brings home a paycheck and doesn't beat [her]." In Carol's case, parental homophobia, however, outweighed the absence of a paycheck and looking like a hippie. Carol explained, "My parents were so worried that I was gay. When they met my boyfriend, even though he had dropped out of school and had long hair, they were so happy that he was a male."

Confronting the metanarrative about marriage required my respondents to give up their internalized societal expectations about marriage and family or, at least, reformulate them. Sarah realized:

> I couldn't be a superwoman. By the time I made the decision that I wasn't going to get married, it was early in my case, they [my parents] tried to put pressure after I made the decision. It was too late because I had made up my

mind. I was old enough that I knew what making up my mind meant. I was as old as twenty-one before I realized that my parents were not always right for me. It took me that long to figure that out.

My respondents' experiences growing up in their families of origin were important factors in shaping their attitudes toward marriage. These experiences taught them that the reality of courtship, marriage, and family did not always conform to society's ideals. Several respondents were raised in difficult and unhappy marriages with angry parents. What they witnessed didn't inspire emulation. Jane, who grew up in a loveless marriage, said, "I never saw a marriage I liked." Barbara told me her father had temper tantrums every day. "He scared the bejezus of out me." Mary explained, "My father was 'the king of the castle.' I was basically intimidated." Susan's and Irene's fathers had been emotionally and sexually abusive to them. Christina remembered her mother as "shouting a lot, mad all the time, and not a happy person." Barbara's mother never sought to publish her short stories for fear of embarrassing her husband. Trudy blamed the suburban lifestyle that many of my respondents in middle-class families had:

> The young husbands were coming from the commuter train on time. They didn't want to come home to screaming kids and all this chaos. And the women were desperate, of course, being in these homes alone, longing for attention from these adult males. . . . The local doctor suggested they do a cocktail hour.

Carol and Diane, who grew up in big cities in working-class families, did not experience the same sort of frustration from their mothers or anger from their fathers. Barbara, Mary, and Christina attributed this emotional situation to their mothers' isolation at home with their children in the suburbs and their fathers

159

coming home to hungry, noisy children after hours spent commuting. Carol's father was absent. Her mother worked. Diane's family had a difficulty making ends meet. Both her parents worked.

Several of my respondents were specifically opposed to marriage. Their reasons included rejection of state sanction, dislike of the housewife role, the hypocrisy of "happy marriages," and the belief that marriage was no more than female servitude. Molly said, "I didn't see the need for the state to sanction my actions." Barbara reasoned that she didn't "feel it was necessary to get married. I could basically do what I wanted without getting married. I didn't love the idea of being legally bound to anybody." Christina spoke about the tension between a personal relationship and the family validation that the public wedding ceremony implied. She chose to avoid marriage rather than to reappropriate it:

> My feminist friends who were getting married in the late '70s, early '80s always said, "Well, I am going to do it differently. My marriage is going to be different. We're writing our own vows. We're getting married in the park. We're gonna do it our own way and it's not gonna be like everyone else's." I believe it is not only up to the individual; it is a societal thing. You may want to do it differently, but you are entering into a socially defined relationship that says you are this to him and he is this to you and that the rest of the world sees that you are trying change it to be more equal. You can write your vows, but you don't get to tell everyone else what being Mrs. "X, Y, and Z" means to them in society and once you're Mrs. "X, Y, and Z" you are a wife and that I strongly believe that marriage is a social convention has a whole social baggage. And I developed this sense that I didn't want that. I saw it in the bigger picture and I didn't want it.

Rachel, originally a heterosexual who later became a lesbian, rejected the lifestyle:

> It just looked so boring—the sort of white picket fence, exactly what's described in *The Feminine Mystique*. I remember when I read it. I cried and cried and cried. I think I was feeling like, Oh my God, I just don't want to

have this kind of life—this white picket fence, boring life; I don't want to do that. That's what I sort of saw in front of me, and I just was like, [don't know] if I'll ever do that.

Irene, a heterosexual, was cynical. "I just thought it [marriage] was full of hypocrisy. I never had any illusions about it. I thought most people weren't happily married who were married." Jane agreed:

I hadn't been fogged over by the '50s and the façade, the politesse, the perfection of the white picket fence lifestyle, even though all my friends were like that, I guess I gave up a long time ago expecting I was going to have a man who was both sexually mutually attracted and somebody who was really nice to live with.

Susan's views were the most extreme. Her focus was on marriage's patriarchal aspect and a married woman's lack of independence and autonomy:

I thought marriage was like slavery, much like Isadora Duncan. When I was twelve, I went to a history museum and saw a wonderful painting protesting the auctioning of slaves and slave children. I was deeply upset by that painting. Mary, my cousin, got married and I was sitting up front. . . I saw her father hand her over to her husband and that really offended me. The way I put it, she never stood on her own two feet. I got this thing that I would stop slavery, including marriage at the time. Isadora Duncan tore up her parent's marriage certificate. She had the same reaction, that marriage was slavery.

Not all of my heterosexual respondents opposed marriage. Three chose to marry for practical reasons, in order to protect their future children. Meredith and Rebecca wanted to avoid the stigma associated with having children and being unmarried. Although Christina's mother knew that she had been cohabiting for 20 years with her children's father, Christina told me that her mother still considered her grandchildren "bastards." Meredith told me she married because "I thought it was important to be married to have kids. I was cynical enough to know that people got

161

married and people got divorced all the time. If you were going to have kids it was probably a good idea to get married." Similarly, Rebecca and her husband conformed to convention for instrumental reasons: "Neither one of us has this strong belief in marriage. We had this Marxist view of what it is. We did it more for the adoption, but I never had the feeling then that being married was so important."

My lesbian feminist respondents may have had opinions about the desirability of marriage, but they didn't have that choice in the '60s. Same-sex marriage was not even a twinkle in anyone's eye!

Mary's choices about her wedding ceremony were emblematic of the decisions that five out of the seven heterosexual, married respondents made. Although several grooms had no problems with donning counterculture garb—a Mexican shirt, a Native American jacket, or a pair of pink hippie overalls—my respondent brides had a hard time surrendering their childhood visions. Their choices for their wedding gowns contradicted their aspirations for sexual freedom. These choices demonstrated the extent to which they had internalized the symbols of society's metanarrative of chastity and "women's place." Mary, like the other four, selected a virginal, white wedding gown to wear down the aisle, despite the fact she (and the others) had cohabited with their partners before tying the knot. One was even pregnant at her wedding ceremony. Molly wore "a white dress, sort of peasanty." Barbara wore a "fabulous" dress, "a 1940s white gown with a ten-foot train." She told me she found it at a thrift store. Carol's wedding dress was a white linen shift with

scalloped embroidery on the hem. Her daughter later told her that the dress in the photos looked like a bathrobe.

In other ways, however, Mary's wedding ceremony and those of the others embodied the '60s feminist New Left and countercultural ideals. Picture a large backyard or park, a couple standing under the trees, family and friends sitting around on folding chairs. The ceremony took place in nature rather than in a church, temple, or city hall. Barbara's first marriage happened in a forest clearing. Her mother and extended family refused to attend what they regarded as a "hippie wedding." In fact, Barbara suspected her mother was on a plane that flew overhead around the same time as the ceremony. The ceremonies minimized religious involvement, disavowed divine sanctification, and replaced it with earthly dedication to the "movement." Irene and her groom, then members of a religious/political cult, were part a group wedding of one hundred couples. Carol and her groom substituted "Avanti Populo" for "Here Comes the Bride." Mary and her husband-to-be substituted a contract for vows, putting the ideas of mutual exchange, practicality, and rationality above faith and the Lord's blessing. The contract rejected romance in favor of friendship and emphasized the husband and wife's self-realization in contrast to their merger. My respondents chose to draw up contracts that they regarded as exchanges between equals. In Mary's words:

> We wrote a contract instead of vows. We will love each other as the closest of friends and share with each other our pain and joy. We both affirm our right to establish and maintain independent relationships for we do not own each other. We'll share equally all of the domestic chores. May our home life contain and be based on equality. We support our political work to overcome the reactionary forces in ourselves and in the world. May we continue to

choose the liberation of all people. We struggle against the attitudes with which we were raised and the fear of closeness that keep us apart. May our lives together inspire us.

Christina and her partner, "her number one man" rather than her "husband," also made a contract that they updated and periodically revised:

We wrote a contract since we weren't going to get married. So we had many pages in the contract about, you know, with things like, we don't know if we'll stay together, but neither of us will deny access to the child, and the child will still have our parents as grandparents. Whether or not we stay together, they'll have those relationships maintained. Oh, we wrote in it that if either one of us wanted us to see a couples' counselor to work on our relationship, the other would agree to go. He's the one that wanted that, interestingly enough. A little role reversal. We wrote in it that we were going to buy a car together. Neither of us owned a car together. And we wrote in it something about our money, that we were going to establish a joint bank account [for household needs]. We were going to put in the joint bank account proportionate to our income. So we planned it all out, but we did not get married and we did not live together at that point.

Saving money and being informal were also important. On short notice, Meredith told her friends, "We're getting married on February 15th. Come to our wedding."

Tony had to work that day, so he came home I think around three o'clock and the wedding was like at four in the afternoon. It was in our apartment and when it was time for Professor Rivera to start the ceremony, somebody stood on a chair and whistled to get everybody's attention. They all came into the room and sat down. Tony's sister who sings and plays the guitar sang a song. A woman who was a friend of ours, a friend of my family's, read a poem. The whole thing took all of fifteen minutes. Then we had a party. Then when the party was over a bunch of us went to the Berkeley Community Theater because they were having a birthday party for Huey Newton who was in jail.

Household Arrangements

Once partnered, my heterosexual respondents soon realized that when it came to establishing a household with their chosen intimate other, more than distancing

164

practices would be needed to preserve their independence and autonomy. If my heterosexual respondents' demands for gender equality and paid employment outside the home were to come to fruition, promises made to each other during their wedding/commitment ceremonies had to be implemented. Tasks necessary to daily life, such as shopping, cooking meals, doing chores, cleaning house, paying bills, and (for those with children) child-rearing, had to be allocated.

Despite the fact that my heterosexual respondents had changed their ideas about their ideal partners (sweet, kind, good listeners, willing to struggle, etc.), and found men embodying these qualities, they realized that their partners' behaviors with regard to the household division of labor and parenting still required adjustment. Rebecca, a heterosexual, married woman in a nuclear family arrangement with one child, put it this way: *"*I have been married to a Marxist. I have been married to a fascist. Neither of them did the dishes." Elizabeth, a heterosexual single woman, told me about incident that happened to Linda, a woman in her consciousness-raising group:

> One of the women [Linda] in our group had a bad back. It hurt her back to sweep and use the dust pan. She couldn't get down to do this, and it really hurt. So she told her husband about this. His solution—he was so proud of himself—was to buy a long-handled dust pan. We were all just. . . you know? "You could do the sweeping!"

Rebecca and Linda were not alone. Irene, a married, heterosexual woman told me:

> My husband had a car. I didn't drive, but he'd expect me to take his shirts to the cleaners on the bus and pick them up because he was teaching and he wore shirts that were pressed. Really stupid things. I can't believe we were doing that stuff.

165

To implement such tasks in a way that would achieve gender equality, my respondents made agreements with their partners about how to organize the household division of labor, make decisions, coordinate tasks, pay bills, and allocate private and common space. A core question underlay these agreements. Was the arrangement of husband, wife and children living together in a single household as a traditional nuclear family an effective way to create gender equality? Six of my heterosexual respondents said yes. They lived alone with their partners or, if parents, were together in a nuclear family. Five of my respondents—heterosexual, lesbian, or bisexual—lived alone or as part of a couple in two separate houses. The remaining six lived in communal arrangements as part of a married or cohabiting couple. All sought household gender equality. My focus here is on the innovative communal arrangements. I draw on the narratives of my respondents who lived in nuclear family arrangements or remained single as points of comparison.

Those who chose communal living rejected their parents' lifestyles and the housewife's role. They wanted to avoid the pressures professional women faced trying to balance their work responsibilities with their family obligations. Living communally offered the possibility of spreading the domestic load, sharing responsibilities, having mutual accountability, and an expanded community instead of social isolation. Christina's views were shared by the other communards:

> We didn't want to be a nuclear family. We didn't want to be like our parents. We didn't want to reproduce the image of the nuclear family patterns that we had grown up with. . . . I never did that. I never set up a house with one partner, male or female. Never. I was always in a group house situation. So I never had to be the wife and I'm sure I did that on purpose because I was so strongly conditioned to be the wife.

166

Sarah added:

> I wasn't able to be superwoman in life. I was going to live collectively. I didn't want to live by myself. . . . I was very clear that I wanted to live in an intentional family. That was the way to solve not being a superwoman. . . . I was tired of going through housemates and roommates. I wanted something more permanent. I wanted kids in my life, even if I wasn't going to propagate them.

My respondents constructed communal households by asking siblings and relatives to join them, by inviting friends, by talking to political comrades, or by advertising through the rental market. Underscoring the importance of emotional ties as the glue of solidarity (Gould 2009), the longevity and the stability of my respondents' communal households depended how the members came together. Communal households that included a core couple, relatives, and friends, such as Meredith's and Molly's households, were the most stable. Molly, her husband, and their two children lived in a large house with another couple and their children for 30 years. Siblings and cousins living just down the street provided support and an outlet for household tensions. Irene's household had a similar structure to Molly's—two couples and their children. Meredith, her husband, his brother, her best friend, and two others found a former boarding house to remodel. According to Meredith, she and her best friend were the glue that held the household together:

> There was a primary relationship between Cathy and me. We had been best friends for many years. We had an enormous loyalty to one another. It was the bond between the two women. It was the motive force behind the collective living arrangement. It was the force that held it together when it seemed like things might fly apart.

Although there was turnover before things settled down, they continue to live there today as an intergenerational household with her husband's mother, their daughter and son, and their families.

Communal households without a couple core or blood ties, but based on already formed friendships and shared political interest or work, came next on the continuum of most to least stable households. Sarah gave herself a year to explore and develop friendships with like-minded individuals she identified through her network of political activists before moving ahead to identify a place to live. For 20 years, Sarah lived with three other single women, communally in a house, once a single-family dwelling, which they named after a nineteenth-century Northern white Christian woman, a communitarian who was run out of town for her charitable work teaching poor "colored girls" to read. Diane's household, like Sarah's, had shared politics, but even more binding, shared work in a movement prison law project. Three factors, however, made the commune less stable, and it only lasted a couple of years. Coming together as graduates of the same law school, they were acquaintances, not necessarily friends. There was no couple core. Moreover, the group was large (seven or eight) and diverse (men and women, gay and straight). Diane told me, "It was kind of amazing! We used the whole house [as bedrooms]."

The least stable and most contentious was Christina's household. The members came through the rental market. Although Christina's household had a core couple, herself and her partner, the other members were diverse and initially strangers:

We were both really clear that having people of different ages, having people related to other people's children were all good ways to broaden people's responsibilities towards each other. My significant other and I ended up buying a house that was big enough to live communally and putting a group of people together which was a lot of work. We didn't ever have just the two of us in this house. We started with the Berkeley housing office, the place where students went to find roommates. The outcome was a lot of turnover. We wanted to create a new house. Guess who wants to be part of that? Single mothers! Lots of single parents out there who are mothers who would just love to have a house and a man. . . . We went through a couple of difficult years trying to set up a communal house with children in it with people who didn't already have a history together.

Once communards had been recruited and a house found, Sarah, Christina, Molly, Meredith, and Irene grappled with how to turn a group of individuals into a working collective. My five communard respondents had to find ways to have household responsibilities equally shared for shopping, meal preparation, and cleaning. A decision-making strategy and a budget were needed. Christina stated clearly her motivation for living communally, which the other heterosexual, coupled respondents making the same choice shared:

I never had to be the wife. I set it up so that I never had to do the wife duties stuff. I agreed with Emma Goldman that the basis for marriage is that women are paid to be taken care of financially in exchange for sex and raising children. I did my chores and they [the other communards] did theirs. I never got married and set up a household that was husband and wife.

Sarah asked a question that touched upon a related issue: How do people living together who have different motivations, skills, interests (and genders) agree to use a common resource?" Sarah described how complicated and frustrating collective decisions can be:

We had differences in our criteria for housework. I would think the floor was dirty. Another person would think it was clean. I would think the garden was a

169

disaster, while the rest of us would think it was great. We had four meetings around the dishwasher. We paid good money to develop this three-section dish board drainer. We keep on fussing about it. First, we decide after a common meal who should empty it. Finally, in the end, there are people who always want it empty and then there are others who can let it fill until they need something.

Composting is another example. Now we have a system that everybody is comfortable with. Like the woman who actually does the composting, she doesn't want to take out the composting to the back porch. She doesn't want to do that part. Trying to get somebody else to do that and nobody wants to take it on, so it is a floating responsibility and then those of us who do it more, have to get after those who don't do it too much. If we are not going to designate it, it doesn't work, if two people never do it. So we finally got them to do it. This is structure versus lack of structure.

To solve the problem of getting different people who shared the same resources to allocate tasks equally, Christina, Diane, Meredith, Sarah, and Irene adopted widely used communal living practices—a rotating chore wheel, house meetings, and a collective budget. A rotating chore wheel was designed to avoid a fixed division of labor and a ranking of specific tasks as more or less desirable. Christina's description about how this system worked for meal preparation was similar to that of other respondents:

Everybody cooked one night and cleaned up after they cooked and we had a rotating chore wheel. They had their cooking night, I had my cooking night. Five or six people meant that you only had to cook one night a week, so you could really make a nice casserole, a salad, and dessert and bread, or you know, ice cream. People would really put out a nice group dinner the one night they had to cook. We just rotated.

To address general household issues, Christina organized house meetings to make group decisions. "We had house meetings where we really talked about problems that came up. We had to have a high level of commitment to the house." To

170

handle finances, each communard put in an equal amount of money for shopping and

household repairs. "We just put in equal amounts, but we made it so that it was cheap

for everybody in those days."

Apart from her contribution to the collective and her willingness to make

household decisions as a group, Christina refused to merge her income with her

partner's. To preserve her freedom and autonomy, she wanted to function as an

individual, not as part of a couple. For her, this meant being economically self-

sufficient and having in a relationship with a man based on love, not economic

necessity:

> I wanted to have my own checkbook based on my own job and anytime I
> needed to I wanted to be able to say goodbye and not be dependent on a man.
> I learned from the early days of the feminist movement that there were a lot of
> housewives that were basically trapped because they didn't even have credit
> cards in their name. I decided as a feminist that I wanted to be financially
> independent. I have had the same bank account since 1972 in my name and I
> won't give it up. It is my money that I earn. No matter what happens to me,
> that been a foundation for me.

The chore wheel's implementation varied in each household according to its

demographic composition, its member's lifestyle preferences, and their employment

status. Diane's household was composed of unattached young men and women who

worked full time as movement lawyers and earned roughly the same amount of

money:

> The seven of us each had a night to cook. We drank a lot and smoked a lot of
> dope. People cared about each other. We would make really nice meals and
> we had our friends over. But we were very functional. As lawyers, we got up
> in the morning and went to work. Everybody worked so we didn't squabble
> about money. We were a group bound together by shared work and common
> political value

Diane's collective, like Christina's, used house meetings for decision-making. "We had house meetings. I remember them as unpleasant and we would go out after and drink."

Meredith's communal household was kitchen- and family-centered. Her husband and their son had built a beautiful long wooden table for family meals. Family closeness made discussions easy. The chore wheel became a daily list that confirmed agreed-upon assignments:

> We didn't have problems organizing stuff. We'd meet at dinnertime and talk about what we were gonna eat and who was gonna cook. Every day it was listed what we were gonna have for dinner that night and who was in charge of cooking. We tried a chore wheel once and it worked. My husband does a lot more housework than I do. We share the shopping. He likes to shop. I don't let him shop as often as he'd like to because I love to shop for food. We go to the farmers market. When our kids eat with us, they help clean up. In terms of housework, he's the one who vacuums. We have two bathrooms, so he does one and I do the other.

The closeness of the two family units made regular house meetings unnecessary. They met only for "big ticket" issues like mortgage refinancing. The two best friends organized the food budget:

> We would divide the food. My best friend and I did this very week. We would count up what we'd spent on food that week and then we would divide it by the "mouth units," we called it. My husband and I represented five mouth units with our three children and she represented three mouth units with her husband and her child.

Sarah's household was composed of three single women—one bisexual, one lesbian, and one celibate. All were employed. Initially, the women used a rotating chore wheel. For reasons cited earlier—differences in skills, interests, and motivations—the chore wheel, according to Sarah, was a "disaster." Ultimately,

assigning tasks based on interest and ability worked better. Sarah explained, "One person was responsible for cleaning, and another was responsible for the garden. I was responsible for grocery shopping. We all cooked and that was OK." As with Christina and Diane, Sarah's household relied on house meetings for decision-making. In Sarah's household, the communards realized that four house meetings over a dishwasher and several over composting was too much, especially in light of the amount of social time they spent together visiting each others' families and going on vacations together. "We stopped having house meetings for four years. That was a terrible mistake. . . . We had so many meetings in the early '70s that we finally had to have less meetings."

Sarah's house was not a retreat or a haven. It was a live/work space, a laboratory for her to translate her feminist beliefs into practice. "This house made me a carpenter." She redesigned what had been a single-family house to physically transform it into a communal arrangement. "We spent a lot of money on insulation to give people privacy." The house, its atmosphere functional and utilitarian, lacked a common decorating aesthetic, a product perhaps of indifference or lack of consensus. No trace of *House and Garden* décor was to be seen. Irene and her husband and their child lived with another married couple and their children. The two couples, all working professionals committed to their careers, cooked one night each. The nanny who got room, board, and a salary was responsible for the children during the day. She ate with them and prepared the remaining two evening meals. A chore wheel delegated individual weekly responsibilities for everyone.

173

Unlike those living in large communal households, my respondents who lived alone, in couples, or in nuclear families did not need to use chore wheels or house meetings in order to organize their households. The five heterosexual women who did not live communally agreed in theory that an equal gender division of household labor was preferable. But in practice, for four of them housework devolved into a traditional male/female division of labor, due to disparities between their relationships and their partners' relationships to the labor market, as well the absence of other people to share the responsibilities. Trudy's, Barbara's, Rebecca's, and Carol's partners all had full-time, well-paying, positions outside the home, while Barbara, an artist with a home art studio, Trudy, a movement/part-time day job worker, and Carol, a researcher and editor, had flexible hours and were at home more than their partners. Although Rebecca had a full-time job, her husband's work involved long-distance commuting and overnight stays. Although Barbara worked in art studio adjacent to their living space and her husband had a job outside the house, she managed to protect her artist's life by dedicating certain days to household work and other days to only her painting and sculpture. Only Mary and her partner, who lived as a couple with one child, were able to achieve an equal division of household labor and time. Both of them worked as schoolteachers and had the same schedules, time-offs, and summer vacations. Instead of a chore wheel, they tacked a list of chores and meal preparation duties onto their refrigerator and ranked them according to their degree of onerousness, the time the chore took, and its importance to the household, and, using these criteria, they divided the list evenly between them.

174

According to Rachel, lesbian couples or communards did not have to struggle

to overcome past gender socialization practices about the household division of labor:

> Most of the couples I knew did not have a sharp division of household
> labor. . . . Our division of household labor was much more about choice or
> predilection for certain tasks than it was about roles. Most people just figured
> it out on the basis of what they liked to do. . . . Most of the time, it is up for
> grabs. There are no immediate assumptions you have to fight against.

Discussions about an equal household division of labor were not an issue for

my heterosexual, lesbian, or bisexual respondents who lived alone or had roommates.

Unlike my respondent communards who valued collectivity and had to compromise

to get along, single women such as Elizabeth and Jane emphasized the feminist values

of independence and autonomy. Elizabeth explained, "Independence is critical. How

we live is critical. Not being dependent on men or anybody. I want to be close to

people, but not to live with them."

Personal preferences shaped their practices. Elizabeth was a self-confessed

health and fitness feminist. Despite the expense, she bought only organic food to

avoid chemical additives and pesticides.

> Every morning I have a special drink. I am very concerned with health and so
> I am very serious about what I eat. I have a fruit drink that I make in my
> blender with six different fruits and ginger, sunflower, and flax seeds. I don't
> eat sugar or drink alcohol. I work out every day.

Jane, a divorcée who never wanted to remarry, shared a house with

roommates. Having roommates allowed her to do what and when she wanted. "I am

independent. I do what I want." She functioned with a laissez-faire attitude, had no

175

expectations of or accountability to others, and preferred casual companionship.

House meetings and a common budget were not on the agenda:

> I never lived alone. Most of my housemates except for right now have been only women. They've all been single, mostly or in transition from a divorce. It's been mostly women who've been younger than I and who were not married, may or may not have wanted to be married, who were reasonable people to live with. I didn't have any other expectations. I didn't expect any lifelong friendships or anything except be reasonable to live with. Eventually some of them became good friends over time after they moved out. We keep in touch. It wasn't my expectation to be a partner. We were sharing a house. That was my advantage and their advantage, both in terms of space and companionship. Casual companionship. No requirements on either side. Just be clean. I'm not a big cleanliness person, as long as people pick up in the common spaces. I don't care what they do in their room.

Trade-offs and Consequences

While my heterosexual respondents understood the necessity of rethinking the qualities their ideal mate should possess and of rethinking the nuclear family as well, they did not anticipate the trade-offs that would ensue. In light of the feminist sartorial guidelines—sturdy shoes, no high heels, loose clothing, not shaving, and no makeup—Olivia's question, "How to be a feminist and still be attractive to men?" captures this trade-off between principles and seduction. Similar issues arose with regard to traditional chivalry. In the name of independence, my respondents refused to have doors opened and chairs pulled out, and insisted on paying their own way, only to incur loss of attention and a financial expense. According to Christina, her experiment with casual sex and non-monogamy was double-edged. As she put it, "It is easy [to do non-monogamy] if you are a jerk and don't care [about the other person]."

176

My heterosexual respondents' experiments in communal living arrangements were intended as an alternative to free them from sole responsibility for the household chores, from the isolation of staying at home with children, and from dependence on and possible subordination to their male partners. Chore wheels, communal household budgets, and group meetings for household planning were the tools my respondents used to make communal arrangements work. The price of sociability was a lack of privacy. The price of shared household responsibilities was endless meetings and the inefficiency that comes with decision-making by group consensus. This concludes my presentation of my respondents' narratives. I step back in Chapter 6 to reflect on the issue of social movement persistence and continuity.

CHAPTER 6. OPPOSITIONAL WORKPLACE AND GENDER PRACTICES: INDIVIDUAL ACTS AND INTERIM TACTICS

In my concluding chapter, I return to my original questions: "What happens when the noise of public protest subsides? In a movement's aftermath, what do my respondents think, feel and do with their movement beliefs and practices in their everyday lives? What factors explain their different choices and oppositional gender practices? How do their practices contribute to the women's movement's persistence and continuity?" In the following sections, I (1) bring to the fore the institutional and psychological, social and cultural factors described in Chapters 4 and 5 that I believe help explain my respondents' variations in their choices and their practices; (2) characterize my respondents' individual acts of persistence; (3) hypothesize about the ways my respondents' actions contribute to the women's movement's continuity and persistence; (4) discuss the ways my dissertation research contributes to scholarship on social movement persistence and continuity; and finally (5) suggest future research possibilities.

Institutional Arrangements

My academic respondents worked in predominantly male, only-woman environments. Their efforts to produce feminist knowledge and content during their working hours were facilitated by their workplace institutional arrangements, e.g., their teaching, research, university and public service functions; the considerable discretion, flexibility, and autonomy the decentralized university structure afforded them; the degree of their department's institutionalization into the university; the

presence or absence of sympathetic colleagues; their disciplines' content; and the professional norm of academic freedom. Aside from their professional associations, my respondents acted as individuals.

In contrast to my academic respondents, my staff respondents worked in female-segregated environments. Their institutional arrangements prevented them (except on their lunch hours and breaks) from using their working hours for their translation process. They were only able to put their feminist beliefs into practice after their 9–5 jobs and on weekends in the community due to a combination of factors: their job functions (providing technical and administrative support), their supervisor's close supervision, and their routine, standardized tasks. Undaunted, these respondents taught San Francisco and Bay Area women about feminist issues in the institutes and educational programs they created in the community and fought for women's rights and equality inside their campus women's union.

My respondents in both occupational categories opposed hierarchical structures and favored consensus decision-making. They sought respite from bureaucratic rationality and individualistic, competitive social relations. Their respective institutional arrangements framed their oppositional practices. The fact that Women's Studies was then a student-run program and not yet institutionalized, the professional norm of academic freedom, and the college dean's policy of decentralizing authority to the departments gave Rachel the latitude to democratize her pedagogy and invert university authority. Olivia and Irene used their authority as department chairs to, respectively, mentor staff and democratize faculty meetings.

179

Carol's extramurally funded university project was relatively autonomous from the university hierarchy, its university connection mediated by a sympathetic tenured faculty member: these factors gave her the latitude to democratize project staff meetings and to control the project budget, allocating a portion of her salary to equalize staff compensation. The contents of my respondents' disciplines influenced the degree to which they were able to implement the production of feminist knowledge. The extent to which their department or project was integrated into the university hierarchy affected how willing my respondents were to challenge the university hierarchy.

Those respondents in either occupational category who had children struggled to find ways to balance their work with their family responsibilities. My respondents in female-segregated university staff positions were sometimes able to accept half-time positions where they were not expected to take work home. Schoolteachers' hours dovetailed with those of their students. Occupying positions designed for men with wives minding the children at home, my female respondents in predominantly academic jobs assumed full-time positions that lacked maternity leave provisions. They did have one privilege that women in staff positions lacked: they and could take sabbaticals like the one Christina used to take each of her children to France for a semester.

Finding ways to get support from other women and avoid misogynistic interactions was difficult for my respondents. My academic respondents in only-woman departments appropriated university practices such as department-sponsored

forums, interdisciplinary programs, and independent study mechanisms to achieve feminist goals, such as being with other women, teaching feminist curriculum, and creating safe places for their students. When she was a graduate student, Christina organized extracurricular confidence-building groups where other female graduate students could learn bicycle and auto repair. As a professor, she sponsored a colloquium featuring women scientists in order to promote their visibility as role models for female graduate students. More secure after receiving tenure, Christina took advantage of a campus-wide interdisciplinary program with other women faculty, also underrepresented in their departments, to create a welcoming place for students interested in courses relating to women and science. Rachel was able to use the mechanism of student independent study for academic credit to resolve a problem involving a male student who was heckling his female classmates. In order to maintain a safe space where her students could voice their opinions and tell their stories, while still complying with the federal Title VII non-discrimination law, she insisted he leave the class and take an independent study course with her to cover the same material.

Psychological, Social, and Cultural Factors

When I began my research, I knew that psychological, social and cultural factors would play a role in shaping my respondents' oppositional practices. However, I thought I would see a direct correspondence between my respondents' workplace and domestic institutional arrangements and their ability to translate their feminist beliefs into practice. I anticipated my respondents in male-dominated jobs

and in traditional married, nuclear family arrangements would have the most difficulty and that those continuing to do movement work and live in alternative arrangements would have the least difficulty. However, I found inconsistencies within individual respondents in their public and private actions (an assertive professional, submissive and passive at home) and unexpected combinations of occupation and household arrangements (a full-time movement activist who accepted her husband's financial support so that she could be an activist full time). I realized the issue was not the relative ease my respondents in different households and occupational arrangements faced in translating their feminist beliefs into practice, but rather that there were multiple, interactive factors shaping my respondents' choices, the challenges they faced, and the trade-offs that different occupational and household arrangements exacted. My respondents' personal motivations, their political and religious beliefs, the college counselors they encountered, their colleagues' misogynistic or supportive attitudes, their class backgrounds, the political climate created by the San Francisco Bay Area's synergy of time and place, their different paths to the women's movement, and the extent to which they had internalized their families of origin's values: All these factors influenced the ways my respondents interpreted events, made their occupational choices, and created their oppositional workplace and domestic gender practices. It is beyond the scope of my dissertation and the capacity of a qualitative rather than a quantitative method to sort out the relative importance and the interactions of these factors. Suffice to say, my respondents' narratives support Mueller's (Mueller 1992:7) advocacy for the

182

integration of a social psychological perspective into social movement analysis as a remedy for the overreliance on structural explanations in resource mobilization and political process theories.

My respondents' different paths to the women's movement (direct, civil rights, students, or antiwar) influenced their women's movement beliefs, their arenas for action, and their practices. Rachel's primary loyalty to the women's movement made her willing to take risks and challenge the patriarchal bias in the traditional curriculum. Irene's need to support her ailing mother made her seek a financially remunerative and secure university position. Diane knew no one would pay her way and she would have to find a practical way to support herself. Olivia's fascination with a newspaper's printed words led her to follow "a thread" that led her to open her own printshop and ultimately teach printing in community college setting. Christina's desire "to learn what was in [her] father's books," as well as the encouragement she received from her professors, paved the way for her academic scientific career. Rebecca and Meredith carried forward their parents' political values. They attributed their commitment to union organizing to both their parents' and their own membership in the Communist Party. Although Rebecca and Meredith were not directly involved in the women's movement, the San Francisco Bay Area synergy of time and place made the women's movement highly visible. Both women absorbed the movement's message by osmosis, incorporating many of the movement's ideas into their union organizing.

Trudy, an Episcopalian minister's daughter, believed she was "doing God's will" when she joined the civil rights movement, which, in turn, led her to the women's movement and to her specific focus on gender and racial justice. Molly's, Susan's, and Mary's negative encounters with college counselors shaped their occupational choices. Rachel's department colleagues, who were sympathetic to her feminist views, gave her permission to follow her feminist beliefs as she designed her syllabus. Conversely, Olivia and Christina had to keep in mind their respectively misogynistic and conservative colleagues as they went about their work.

Irrespective of their occupational locations and sexual preferences, all my respondents experienced parental and cultural pressures to be passive, to marry, and to have children. My respondents' different class backgrounds influenced the reasons their parents gave them about the importance of marrying. Barbara's and Susan's upper-class parents insisted their daughters become debutantes and find a man with the appropriate wealth and pedigree that would increase their family's status and wealth. Trudy's middle-class parents instructed her to go to college to find an educated man with a strong work ethic, not a coupon clipper. Rebecca's working-class parents urged her to find a man who would not beat her and to get herself a good job in case he left.

Variations in the sustainability of my respondents' communal living experiments illustrate the important role emotional ties played in creating the glue that helped the communards solve a key issue in communal living—how to allocate and distribute common resources among a group of people with shared values, but

who had different motivations, interest, skills, and available time. Communal households that included a core couple, relatives and friends, such as Meredith's, Irene's, and Molly's households, were the most stable. Communal households like Diane's and Sarah's, based not on a core couple or blood ties, but rather on already formed friendships and shared work or political interests, came next. Christina's house, which relied on participants recruited through the rental market, was the least stable. My respondent's use of the chore wheel to coordinate chores and meal preparation varied according to their lifestyle preferences, employment status and gender.

Despite their best intentions, their childhood socialization into traditional gender roles affected the ways my respondents dealt with the household division of labor. Citing gender differences in definitions of what constituted "clean" and "dirty," one of Christina's female housemates believed that men rarely saw dirt and never learned proper cleaning techniques. Believing it would make her work less onerous, she always signed up on the chore wheel to clean house after Christina. Traditional gender socialization worked both ways. Molly, Mary, and Christina sheepishly confessed their unwillingness to take on traditional male jobs, such as electrical repairs and tasks requiring carpentry skills.

In the following sections, I revisit my respondents' narratives to illustrate how these additional factors, combined with institutional arrangements, facilitated their efforts to persist as individuals and to use their oppositional gender practices to promote women's movement persistence and continuity. My respondents' post–mass

movement persistence happened on two levels: first, on the individual level, through

their continued beliefs and oppositional acts; and second, on the structural and

cultural levels, through the impacts their oppositional gender practices have on those

around them and continue to have into the future.

The Role of Oppositional Gender Practices in the Women's Movement's Persistence and Continuity: Individual Acts of Persistence

Unlike Whalen and Flacks's Isla Vista former '60s activists, my respondents

held on to their feminist identities and core feminist beliefs. They persisted in their

activism, albeit in different ways. Eleven respondents did follow the path of

individuation that Whalen and Flacks (1989) attribute to their former Isla Vista

activists. But like my four respondents who had movement/day jobs and the two who

became independent professionals, they did not become apolitical or more

conventional. In fact, Meredith and Irene became more radical. Meredith added

feminist spirituality and goddess-worship to her Communist Party–influenced

emphasis on class struggle. Irene defied the assumption that advancing age means

increasing conservatism. Tenure had given her job security. Emboldened, Irene no

longer cared whether she was invited to serve on federal government health

committee review boards. Instead, she got involved in electoral politics, pushing a

citizen's initiative on a contentious reproductive rights issue and writing a

controversial book for a general audience.

Some of my respondents' political arenas, their intensity levels, and their

tactics did change over time. Understandably, many of my respondents had recently

186

retired at the time of my interviews. The institutional opportunities and constraints that characterized their different arrangements as academics, independent professionals, movement/day workers and as staff followed them into retirement. For different reasons, my academic respondents Irene and Rachel didn't need to and chose not to change their political arenas. Rachel continued to teach at another university. Although Irene no longer had her classrooms or her department's conference rooms, she still had her research projects and her voice as an expert. She continued her oppositional workplace gender practices inside her professional association's women's caucus. Irene expanded what had been her university service role to become a public intellectual.

Once in the workforce, my respondents sustained their feminist identities in the ways they chose to dress, how they behaved, and (for some of them) keeping newly their adopted feminist names. Irrespective of their occupations, the majority of my heterosexual respondents affirmed their feminist identities by continuing to reject tight-fitting clothes, cinched waists, nylon stockings, and high heels. To reinforce feminist values of naturalness and strength, and to enable easy movement, my respondents' clothing remained loose-fitting, were made from organic fabrics, and deemphasized the womanly contours of their bodies.

My respondents' reasons for their sartorial choices varied according to their occupational choices, their specific situations, and their sexual preferences. My respondents' stylistic practices ranged along a continuum from traditional feminine, to a hybrid mix of feminist and traditional, to wearing the feminist uniform of jeans,

187

T-shirts, and flat shoes, to looking "butch." When they were in only-woman workplace arrangements, my respondents wanted to appear professionally legitimate—even if that meant adopting feminine dress. Carol, an archivist and editor, wore a string of white pearls, a sign of culture and tradition, to appear more conventional when she went to Washington to seek project funding. Irene regarded clothing as a prop. She found a compromise between her feminist perspective and convention, choosing pantsuits, not jeans. Diane would wear pants and earrings, but never a suit or heels. She was sure to carry her briefcase. Christina waited until she received tenure to dress casually.

By contrast, my respondents in female-segregated positions were not concerned about legitimacy. They were where they were supposed to be. Their priorities were functionality and comfort. Rebecca fought to change the university's dress code that required staff serving the public to wear dresses, stockings, and heels, but allowed staff in the back room to wear pants. Mary continued to wear pants instead of dresses to work so that she could sit on the floor with her third graders.

My lesbian respondents, unconcerned about attracting male desire, continued to dress and act in ways that valorized qualities they wished for themselves. The exercise that Rachel assigned to her students is illustrative. She instructed them to see how it felt to stride purposefully. To paraphrase her words, she told them to sit to sit as men did, with their legs apart instead of with their legs crossed, to stride instead of wiggling their hips, and to wear comfortable shoes that allowed them to more quickly instead of prancing on high heels.

188

My respondents' continued commitment to maintaining feminist dress was, in some instances, ambivalent and contradictory. Despite objecting to the norm about chastity before marriage, my heterosexual respondents who chose to marry chose to wear white wedding dresses, a sign of the virginity they eschewed. Feeling less pressure for feminist ideological purity, several of my heterosexual respondents yielded to the dominant culture's feminine beauty standards. A few wore eyeliner and lipstick. Others even dyed their graying hairs. Shaving and obsessing about weight were the points of self-confessed backsliding. Irene didn't want to embarrass her more conservative daughter with her hairy legs. Mary was too embarrassed to go into a swimming pool unshaven. Olivia explained her rationale—this time it was not to be more attractive to men. In the '60s, Olivia wore combat boots, flannel shirts, and jeans. "Now," Olivia explained, "I am getting myself together, building myself from the ground up in the physical sense." Finally, Susan, Trudy, and Barbara kept the names they had given themselves in the women's movement's heyday. These new names set them apart from convention, affirmed their feminist identities, and signaled to like-minded others and social movement organizations that they were approachable.

Unlike my academic, independent and movement/day job respondents, my respondents in female-segregated occupations did change their political arenas. As retirees, Rebecca, Meredith, Mary, and Molly no longer wanted to or could use their former positions as platforms for their union organizing. Instead, they shifted from

189

confrontation tactics in their workplace to confrontation tactics in the community (See section on movement spillover).

Several respondents reduced their levels of political intensity in both directions. Olivia spent more of her time in the San Francisco soup kitchen, but she softened her anger. "I take the longer view. I want to work very small. If I can serve a meal, *zei gezunt*." Rachel's and Diane's tactics also became less confrontational. Ill health and age-related issues changed some of my respondents' energy levels. Two of my respondents had suffered from breast cancer. Susan told me that her illness had restricted her mobility. Now she only could do "electronic activism." As Rachel put it, "We may not be marching with the young'uns, but we are standing on the curb, holding signs, waving them on."

In one important way, however, my respondents' post–mass movement practices matched those of Whalen and Flacks's former activists. Whalen and Flacks observed that, in the aftermath of the heyday of the '60s movement, his former activist subjects wanted to compensate for their neglect of their personal, spiritual, and physical needs. My respondents also felt this way. Retirement gave Molly, Olivia, and Mary more free time to complement their political work with activities that nourished their creative and spiritual needs. Olivia returned to playing the piano, something she had enjoyed as a young child. Mary took up quilting. Molly spent more time doing *ikebana* (Japanese flower arranging). Molly found it hard to give up her totalist mindset. She struggled with the idea that her aesthetic interests alone could be sufficient justification for spending so much time turning flowers into

190

sculptures. She debated if she should find a way to construct her sculptures to also convey a political message.

What accounts for my respondents' persistent feminist beliefs and activism? Like the former activists Whalen and Flacks interviewed, who had been involved in the Isla Vista Bank of America burning, my respondents were highly committed. I developed my "highly committed" selection criteria because I assumed that women who met these standards would have the strongest beliefs and practices. Absent a comparison group of rank-and-file women's movement participants, however, I don't know if my assumption is correct. My respondents shared a sense of "not fitting"— the gap between the metanarrative about "women's place" and their talents and the emerging education and job opportunities. Several told about their mothers' dissatisfaction with the housewives' stay-at-home role. My respondents were an impressive cohort. Irrespective of their occupational choices and sexual preferences, my respondents possessed personal qualities of independence, originality, spiritedness, and nonconformity. These qualities gave them the foresight to see a match existed between their interests, talents, and skills and the women's movement's message of female independence, the right to achievement, and the right to creative and sexual expression. These qualities, in addition to the totalist mindsets that characterized the dispositions of my movement/day job respondents, predisposed them to risk-taking, resilience, and perseverance, qualities necessary to stay in the women's movement for the long haul. Several respondents' involvement in martial arts and assertiveness training classes helped them overcome feelings of inferiority

and helplessness and supported their motivation to persist long-term. Taking advantage of social networks and helpful allies within institutions, embracing anti-materialist values, and economizing financially put my highly committed respondents in positions to further their feminist objectives. A few had the good fortune of having inherited wealth that allowed them to do feminist work either fulltime or by earning their living with day jobs that didn't distract them from their women's movement commitment.

Oppositional Gender Practices as Interim Practices to Sustain the Women's Movement Between Cycles of Protest

Snow et al.'s (1986) and Benford and Snow's (2000) general concepts of "social movement frames," "frame alignment," "frame resonance, salience, and empirical credibility," "bridging," and "sentiment pools" allowed me to hypothesize about how my respondents' practices might have contributed to second-wave movement continuity and persistence. Applying Goffman's frame analysis concept to the process of social movement mobilization, Snow et al. and Benford and Snow address the issue of movement diffusion, a process I consider relevant to understanding how my respondents transmitted their beliefs and practices to others.[27] These scholars argue that an individual's willingness to join a social movement organization is dependent, among other things, on a frame's successful inclusion of three key components—diagnosis (articulation of grievances and identification of the enemy), motivation (a call to action), and prognosis (proposed solutions)—and on the alignment with a potential activist's values, beliefs, and attitudes with those of the

social movement organization. A frame's ability to recruit adherents also depends on its resonance (the extent to which the alignment is meaningful to the individual), its salience (how important the movement's message is to individual's core set of beliefs), and its empirical credibility (the claim-maker's legitimacy and the degree to which facts support the social movement's messages). Finally, "bridging" is the process by which the alignment occurs. The bridging process results in creating "sentiment pools" composed of individuals receptive to a movement's message, but who are as yet unorganized.

My respondents' oppositional gender practices didn't happen in isolation. On the basis of my Chapters 3, 4, and 5 findings, I hypothesize that between the decline of a mass movement's public visibility and the emergence of the kinds of new, collective forms (of the sort discussed by scholars Taylor, Buechler, Whittier, and Katzenstein), my respondents' oppositional workplace and domestic gender practices served as interim tactics that helped to sustain the women's movement between cycles of protest. Their practices initiated an ever-widening two-way bridge that enabled individuals in their orbits of influence to adopt their beliefs, to emulate their practices, and to identify like-minded others and the kinds of social movement organizations they might join. In turn, the existence of these practices also helped those organizations to identify individuals to recruit and design a message that would resonate with them. My respondents' interim oppositional gender practices address Snow et al.'s (1986:1) criticism that frame alignment overgeneralizes and fails to make its messaging constituency-specific (See p. 14).

In the workplace, my respondents' oppositional gender practices (1) produced and preserved and transmitted feminist knowledge and consciousness, (2) modeled feminist-inspired behaviors for others to emulate, 3) promoted solidarity, and (4) influenced other movements via "social movement spillover" (Meyer and Whittier 1994; Whittier 2004). In the private arena of the family and the household, my respondents' oppositional domestic gender practices decoupled the links between sexuality, reproduction, family, and household arrangements. Their practices and those of others like them had a profound impact on the general population's attitudes and practices about masculinity, femininity, sexuality, marriage, and the division of household labor (McAdam 1999).

The goal of feminist scholarship and curriculum was to remedy the omission of women from history and experience, to correct its traditional patriarchal bias in a discipline's theoretical, methodological and pedagogical paradigms, and to bring a gendered lens to develop new concepts and perspectives. In their classrooms, my respondents inspired student sentiment pools, changing students' attitudes and beliefs and even influencing their life courses. Academic credentials, substantive knowledge, the bona fide of being feminist activists, and the authority embedded in their professorial roles gave my academic respondents the necessary empirical credibility. My respondents' feminist course content resonated deeply with their female college-age students who were at critical points in their adult development. My academic respondents' interests and their institutional arrangements determined the extent to which they could incorporate Snow et al.'s and Benford and Snow's key

194

components—diagnosis, motivation, and prognosis—into how they framed their feminist content. Rachel had the most latitude, Christina and Oliva had the least. Irene was somewhere in between. Rachel was willing to take risks with controversial feminist topics because she was primarily loyal to the women's movement rather than to her job, she had her colleagues' support, and the dean's policy of decentralizing authority gave her department relative autonomy. Her use of peer editing, as well as her view that her syllabus (organized as a contract between her and her students) should reflect student interests, likely enhanced her students' retention of the material and their investment in sharing what they learned with others. Christina's and Olivia's gender-neutral disciplinary content, chemistry and printing respectively, made including feminist content difficult. Nonetheless, Christina motivated her students by inserting the scientific contributions of women scientists as examples of what her female students could aspire to achieve. Olivia hoped her students would adopt and then take into their professional lives her feminist/humanist values of creativity by using lines of poetry and art rather than blocks as her printing materials. Irene's efforts to disseminate feminist scholarship were constrained by the predetermined content of her department's established curriculum. My respondents' colleagues, the readers of their scholarship, the audience that listened to their presentations or asked for their expertise gave my academic respondents other sentiment pools in addition to their students.

My respondents not only created and disseminated feminist ideas and raised awareness, they made their material products available to future generations : Irene's,

Rachel's, Christina's, and Molly's feminist curricula; Carol's books on feminist activists; Irene's writings on women's health; Olivia's students' poetry exercises, Rachel's and Susan's lesbian history and women's movement archives; Barbara's clay cake sculptures; Lynn's photos; Mary's flower collages; Trudy's newspaper articles; and Diane's legal writings.

The women's movement's advocacy for equality and its opposition to hierarchy and top-down decision-making aligned with the values and nonconforming personalities of my respondents in male-dominated and female-segregated positions. Their oppositional workplace gender practices contributed to movement persistence by promoting equality and challenging the university's hierarchy. Molly's insistence on including the school's secretaries in teachers' meetings, Rachel's inversion of the university's hierarchy by bringing her students into her meeting with administrators, Carol's taking on secretarial minutes-taking duties at staff meetings and sharing a portion of her salary with staff to equalize their compensation, Olivia's student-run printshop, her mentoring efforts with her budget officer and student counselor, and her invitation to her secretary to be a colleague on a project: these all sent messages to their coworkers, subordinates, and customers to learn from, to emulate, and to model for others social relationships based on inclusivity and cooperation, rather than individualism, competition, and hierarchy. Finally, my respondents' desires to seek respite from the university's hierarchy and their misogynist colleagues led them to create islands of community, care, and advocacy within their bureaucracies. These islands encouraged face-to-face interactions, political discussion, and emotional

bonds that encouraged sisterly solidarity. For Christina, it was her interdisciplinary program that distanced her from "one more layer of male hierarchy." For Olivia, it was her student printshop on campus and her soup kitchen in the community. For Rebecca and Meredith, it was their union's Executive Committee in particular and the union membership in general. For Jane, it was her social network and feminist institute in the community. These oases fostered emotional connections among its members, possibly encouraging their future receptivity to social movement outreach efforts.

Meyer and Whitter (1994) and Whittier (2004) define "social movement spillover" as the process by which individuals and organizations influence each other. My respondents' movement spillover took place concurrently while they were in the workforce and sequentially after retirement. Rebecca's dual membership in the Communist Party and the women's union as well as her absorption of the women's movement's messages from a distance put her in a position where, in her words, she was "able to connect the dots" between gender, race, class, and the larger issues of the day. Her union's involvement in a campaign to send penicillin to Vietnam to combat venereal disease among women infected by U.S. soldiers during the Vietnam War represents the impact of movement spillover on her union's political frame designed to reach out to her union members, the women's community, and the antiwar effort.

The San Francisco Bay Area's synergy of time and place, the plethora of regional social movement political groups and organizations, and the dynamic of osmosis offered my respondents avenues, following their retirements, for transmitting

197

their feminist beliefs and practices as members of other social movement organizations, contributing, in this way, to the women's movement's continuity. Post-retirement, my respondents' past workplace arrangements set the parameters for their new political arenas. As previously mentioned, my academic respondents could continue to use the research and service job functions they had while employed. These functions became their new vehicles for transmitting their feminist beliefs and practices now, through their writings and in their professional associations.

By contrast, Meredith's and Rebecca's prior use of their jobs as platforms for union organizing was no longer feasible after they retired. Instead, they shifted their organizing energy into the community. Family and neighborhood considerations influenced Rebecca's, Meredith's, and Mary's choices about their arenas and tactics. Rebecca's new arena and target was the juvenile justice system. Her child had gotten into trouble. Meredith joined the board of a community radio station fighting against the intransigent management of the national office. Her sentiment pool became the broadcast community and public radio listeners. Molly did voter registration, reaching out to the electorate as her sentiment pool. Mary organized her neighbors to fight against the negative health effects of a cell tower nearby.

McAdam (1999:137) argues that aggregate lifestyle changes should be studied as an aspect of should be considered part of studies on the biographical consequences of social movement activism. I agree. He speculates that a three-stage process occurs.

> [It] shapes the dissemination of an alternative life course patterns—rejection of life course norms in favor of more "liberated alternatives," the embedding of these alternatives within a diverse set of geographic and subcultural locations that came to be principle repositories of '60s experience e.g. elite

public and private college campus and towns. . . and, finally the dissemination of these patterns in increasingly heterogeneous communities.

My respondents' background characteristics and women's movement experiences support McAdam's three-stage process. All went to college. The majority had advanced degrees. Most attended elite colleges and universities. Their experiences in the San Francisco Bay Area, with its multiple higher education institutions, amid '60s protests, with its synergy of time and place, meet McAdam's criteria for intense collective interactions and dissemination outlets. My respondents' rejection of chastity before marriage, their advocacy for sexual freedom, their openness to same-sex relations, their views that heterosexual marriage should be a contract between equals, their critiques of the nuclear family, and their communal living experiments as an alternative to the nuclear family certainly qualify my respondents as being part of a subculture in favor of more "liberated alternatives."

I do not claim a direct line exists between my respondents' actions and those of others like them and today's life cycle trends. I do suggest, however, there is a link. My respondents' beliefs and practices were bellwethers of changes in practices around sexuality, marriage, childbearing, and living arrangements. My lesbian respondents, along with others like themselves, broke taboos surrounding same-sex intimacy. On June 26, 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down state bans on same-sex marriage in all 50 states. Today, 67 percent of Americans support same-sex marriage (Masci, Brown, and Kiley 2019). Lynn pioneered lesbian donor insemination and became a single mother by choice with two children. It would have

199

been hard for her to imagine then that an organization called Single Mothers by Choice would exist today, with a membership of 30,000 lesbian and heterosexual single women (Single Mothers by Choice 2019). My heterosexual respondents rejected the norm of chastity before marriage. One experimented with non-monogamy, and several cohabited with their partners before marrying, if they married at all. Today, marriage rates are down and 77 percent of respondents to a *2002 National Survey of Family Growth 1982–2002* said they had sex before they were 20 years old (Finer 2007). My heterosexual respondents envisioned the ideal type male partner as a person who was sensitive, a good listener, and sweet. They expected him to share the household division of labor. Today, although mothers still do more childcare than their partners (13.5 hours per week for mothers in 2011, compared with 7.3 hours for fathers), fathers have nearly tripled their time with children since 1965. In addition, men's time doing household chores has more than doubled since 1965 (from an average of about four hours per week to about 10 hours) (Pew Research Center 2013).

Contribution to Social Movement Scholarship on Movement Persistence and Continuity

My dissertation shares feminist and new social movement scholars Rupp and Taylor's, Staggenborg's, and Katzenstein's critiques of resource mobilization and political process theorists with regard to their focus on the social movement organization as the basic unit of analysis, a focus that leads them, as a consequence, to overlook the existence of protest in everyday life. However, like the mainstream

theorists they criticize, these feminist and new social movement scholars only consider instances of collective action. My dissertation situates itself in the space in between the social movement organization and the emergence of the collective forms that these scholars cite. I contribute to feminist and new social movement scholarship by suggesting that individual acts of persistence and individual oppositional practices function as interim tactics that are signs of social movement persistence and continuity because they serve to create sentiment pools amenable to recruitment by the kinds of collective forms that feminist social movement scholars have documented. In making this case, my dissertation also underscores that the inclusion of structural factors (institutional arrangements) and constructive factors (my respondents' internalization of their families of origin's values, their religious and political beliefs, etc.) enriches social movement analysis. To feminist social movement scholars who are interested in protest in everyday life between protest cycles, my dissertation documents that in the case of the women's movement, at the very least, the bedroom and the kitchen, not just the workplace and the boardroom, are arenas for feminist political struggles. In effect, my focus on the role institutional arrangements play in shaping the parameters of my respondents' oppositional gender practices introduces a new variable into the lexicon of "political opportunities," so central to the resource mobilization and political process paradigms.

Future Research

I suggest that the concept of oppositional practice in the everyday lives and institutional arrangements of my respondents can be applied to the study and

comparison of whether, and if so how, former activists in other social movements translated their beliefs into practice in their everyday lives. While social movements based on identity and/or social issues such as oppositional environmental, anti-racist, and the LGBTQ movements are obvious choices, researchers could also examine individual oppositional practices inside institutions as potential precursors of Katzenstein's (1998) "unobtrusive mobilizations."

Further research would also be useful to support what are now speculative claims, i.e., that my respondents' actions in their post–mass women's movement everyday lives at work and at home are interim oppositional gender practices that function as bridges between protest cycles, by catalyzing sentiment pools composed of individuals, not yet organized, but receptive to the messages of future protest cycles. For example, women's studies alumnae's participation in women's movement's abeyance organizations or social movement communities could be assessed to support my claim that my respondents' production of knowledge and feminist awareness in their classroom fostered subsequent feminist activism. Similarly, interviews with current University of California campus women's union leaders and content analysis of the union's leaflets could be explored to see if and how subsequent union leaders continued Rebecca's and Meredith's feminist-inspired practices (promoting coalitions with women's community groups on women's issues and developing a gendered lens on general political issues). Organizational studies targeting industry, nonprofits, and government about team-building flat organizational structures could include questions tailored specifically to women

managers to find out if their leadership styles were influenced by their exposure to

New Left and second-wave feminist's consensus decision-making and anti-

hierarchical practices. My contention—that my respondents created islands of

community and care inside institutions to promote solidarity—could be explored in

other occupations and organizational settings to elaborate Evans and Boyte's concept

of free spaces, not just in the community, but inside institutions as well.

NOTES

Epigraph: Marx, Karl. 2000. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." P. 329 in *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* 2nd ed., edited by David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1 Tarana Burke, Senior Director at Girls for Gender Equity in Brooklyn, is a civil rights activist and a three-time survivor of sexual assault. She is considered the founder of the Me Too global movement. In 2006, she coined the term, "me too" while on staff at Just Be, Inc., a nonprofit devoted to empowering young women of color. The term is intended as a sign of support and solidarity with survivors of sexual assault. On October 15, 2017, actress Alyssa Milano used the hashtag, #MeToo on the social media platform Twitter, to invite sexual assault survivors to share their stories. This Twitter invite went viral globally. (Biography.com Editors, 2018) .

2 According to Kecskemeti's introduction to Mannheim's six posthumously published essays (1952), Mannheim defines a political generation as a cohort of young adults who come of age in a specific historical moment. That moment's social, political, economic forces shape their standpoint, e.g. the values, beliefs, and attitudes that frame their views and actions over the course of their lives. My respondents are

part of the '60s generation. Chapter 3 of this dissertation details the historical forces shaping my respondents in the '60s.

3 Not considering gender as an analytic category leads McAdam to misinterpret findings about gender differences in the frequency of and the reasons for marriage and divorce among participants in the civil rights movement's Freedom Summer project. Using data gathered from his Freedom Summer study, McAdam notes in subsequent articles that former activists divorced more frequently than their non-activist counterparts. He ignores the finding that former activist women married even less frequently than their male counterparts. Instead, he focuses on activist/ non-activist comparisons and attributes the higher former activist divorce rate to the absence of the emotional glue of having a shared commitment between married couples in the post-movement aftermath. This interpretation overlooks the possible consideration that the female Freedom Summer activists, many who later joined the second wave feminist movement, could have been reluctant to participate in what they thought could be an unequal marriage and also had less need to do so because they were more economically independent (McAdam 1989 and 1992).

4 Persisters are former '60s activists who chose occupations consonant with their values or who live outside the mainstream to avoid complicity with oppressive institutions. Disengaged radicals are former '60s activists who remain left in their political conviction, but are pessimistic about change, want security, and are no longer politically active. And left-wing liberals, the largest group, are former '60s activists who embrace some conservative views, break with their activist paths, and think their sacrifices for the movement were excessive.

5 Snow et al. (1986:1) define social movement frame alignment as the linkage or conjunction of the individual and the SMO interpretive framework. The four processes are: (1) frame bridging, (2) frame amplification, (3) frame extension, and (4) frame transformation. In the case of my respondents, the feminist movement's message about women's right to work outside the home aligns with my respondents' frustration at the gap between their education, their skills, and the traditional expectation that they should be satisfied as stay-at-home housewives.

6 Freeman (1972) and Echols (1989) point out the downside of this feminist organizational model. In her famous essay, "The Tyranny of Structurelessness," Freeman argues that feminists' opposition to centralized, hierarchical organizations with clear leadership had made it difficult for members to hold their leaders accountable and make their organizations effective. Echols' historical analysis of the radical feminist movement wing detailed the infamous dynamic of "trashing" prevalent in the movement's heyday when those seeking to exercise political leadership were labeled as "elitist." Morgan's (1977) and Freeman's (1975) painful autobiographical histories of the women's movement underscored the psychological and political damage this practice exacted. 204

7 As part of the structuralist/constructivist debate, Tilly contemptuously dismisses Whittier's use of the concept of collective identity to characterize the nature of second-wave feminist movement's continuity. Tilly rejects Whittier's claim that social movements consist of networks, organizations, and individuals bound together by shared allegiances. Instead, Tilly argued that social movements are not solidaristic or coherent on-going groups. They are "clusters of performances in public spaces that mount a sustained challenge to power holders on behalf of a population living under their jurisdiction."

8 My feminist activism has centered on fostering feminist scholarship, workplace equity for women and minorities in higher education, and women's health issues in California and internationally. In my university positions as an advocate for women, I taught the first women's health course at UC Berkeley. At UC Davis, I established a Women's Research and Resource Center Graduate Student Award for Feminist Research, wrote a report titled "Academic Barriers for UC Davis Women's Faculty," and organized a monthly Interdisciplinary Feminist Faculty Seminar. At San Francisco State University, I established a Stay in School Family Resource Center for Cal Works student parents, a Program on Gender and Public Policy, and an annual San Francisco State University Women's History Month and International Women's Day Public Lecture Series. As a policy analyst in the California Department of Health Services, I was instrumental in the passage of AB321: Medi-Cal Prenatal Care. I was a member of the California Department of Health Services Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, a co-founder of the San Francisco Democratic Women in Action, and a San Francisco Commission and Department on the Status of Women's delegate to the Annual United Nations Women's Conference.

9 Goodwin and Jasper's 1999 *Sociological Forum* article, "Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory," ratcheted up the two camps' debates and led to the authors' anthology, *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions (*Goodwin and Jasper 2004*)*, where the article is reprinted. On the new social movement side, Goodwin and Jasper accused resource mobilization theorists et al. of "tautological reasoning, trivial arguments, and being just plain wrong" (Goodwin and Jasper 2004:17). In her essay "Culture is Not Just in Your Head," Polletta (2004) extends an olive branch. She criticized resources mobilization et al. scholars for creating a binary opposition between culture and structure, but here claims the two are interdependent and reciprocally determining. On the resource mobilization and political process side, Tarrow (2004) and Tilly (2004) counter by saying new social theorists cherry-picked their examples, unfairly criticizing resource mobilization scholars for invariant models, for failing to recognize that cultural and strategic processes define and create factors usually portrayed as structural. Tarrow's (2004:37) concluding words: What they [new social movement theorists] are really saying is, "You are underestimating the importance of variables I find interesting."

This contentious tone has softened. In his recent book, *What is a Social Movement?* Johnston (2014) declares a detente has been reached between the structuralist and social constructivists. Despite initial resistance, resource mobilization and political process theorists appear to have listened to their new social movement critics. Kurzman (2004) writes that Tilly and Tarrow no longer insist that without political opportunities, protest won't happen. Tarrow (2004) has abandoned the word structure." He now speaks about political opportunities as a leading, but not the only, factor, along with meanings, identities, and forms of social mobilization and social networks. Finally, McAdam (2004) revisits his dissertation/book in light of new social movement scholarship to "make a start towards a theoretical synthesis of structuralist, rationalist and culturalist approaches to collective action." Tipping his hat to social constructivists, he acknowledges the importance of subjectivity, but insists that meaning must be grounded in historical context, local history and culture, and extra-local politics. In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* (Morris and Mueller, 1992), Gamson, author of the resource mobilization classic, *The Strategies of Social Protest,* acknowledges the importance of social psychological concepts such as collective identity, solidarity, consciousness, and micromobilization and calls for integrating the different levels of individual, social and cultural analysis (Gamson, 1992).

10 From Mills (1959: 8), I took the commitment to locate individual feminist biographies in their historical context of macro-structural trends. C.W. Mills calls this commitment the task and the promise of the sociological imagination. For Mills, social science deals with the problems of biography, of history, and of their interactions within social structures. His statements "Neither the life an individual nor the history of a society can be understood without understanding both" and "Private troubles are public issues" capture his perspective. I am inspired by Maynes, Pierce, and Laslett's (1989), personal narratives method. Personal narratives are defined as retrospective, first-person accounts. This method offers historians and social scientists a valuable tool to apply Mills's ideas. Like Mills, the three authors are concerned with human agency and the relationship between individual and society. They emphasize the importance of locating personal narratives in their historical context and querying subjects about how their experiences are shaped by their interaction with others and the institutions they participate in. I take from them my focus on the impact of institutional arrangements on my respondents' abilities to translate their feminist beliefs into workplace and domestic oppositional gender practices. Similarly, Reinarman (1987: viii) models this methodological/theoretical approach in *American States of Mind: Political Beliefs and Behavior Among Private and Public Workers*. He writes, "My analysis is an attempt to study the macro-level issues of this moment in our history by looking at how these issues are refracted in the micro-level of a life history."

11 Parsons's structural functional paradigm and Merton's quantitative methods dominated my early '60s graduate sociology training at University of California,

Berkeley. In an effort to approximate the natural sciences' experimental design, mainstream sociologists taught the importance of value-free research, hypothesis-testing, control groups, and general theory (Nagel 1962).

12 To assess the intensity and the frequency of my "highly committed" feminist activists, I ask them if they met at least three out of these nine criteria: (a) participating in a consciousness-raising group or its equivalent; (b) giving money to feminist causes; (c) signing feminist petitions; (d) attending mass demonstrations, rallies and pickets to advocate for women's issues; (e) paying women's movement organizations' membership dues; (f) reading their organizations' newsletters; (g) attending general meetings; (h) serving on women's movement organization subcommittees, or (i) serving in a leadership role in a women's movement organization.

13 In *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Protest* (2001:5), Mansbridge and Morris define "oppositional consciousness" as an "empowering mental state that prepares members of an oppressed group to act to undermine, reform, or overthrow a system of human domination. It is usually fueled by a righteous anger over injustices done to the group and prompted by personal indignities and harms suffered through one's group membership. At a minimum, oppositional consciousness includes four elements: identifying those injustices done to the group, opposing those injustices, seeing the group as having a shared interest in ending or diminishing those injustices. A more full-fledged oppositional consciousness includes identifying a specific dominant group as causing and, in some ways, benefiting from those injustices. It also includes seeing certain actions of the group as forming 'a system' of some kind that advances the interests of the dominant group. Finally, it can include other ideas, beliefs and feelings that provide coherence, explanation, and moral condemnation."

I use Mansbridge and Morris's concept of oppositional consciousness to understand my respondents' consciousness development process. "Seeing the group as having a shared interest in ending or diminishing those injustices" describes my respondents' process of becoming "women-identified." "Identifying those injustices done to the group," including "identifying a specific dominant group as causing and, in some ways, benefiting from those injustices," and "see[ing] certain actions of the group as forming 'a system' of some kind that advances the interests of the dominant group" describes the process my respondents call "the click." However, I broaden the applicability of Mansbridge and Morris's concept by examining opposition in the material world. I label my respondents' narratives about their oppositional actions, "oppositional gender workplace and domestic practices." Mansbridge and Morris do not consider how mental states turn into action. I take into account how oppositional gender consciousness affects oppositional gender practices.

14 In the '80s, the women of color and third world feminist scholars cited criticized white feminist scholars for assuming a universal sisterhood existed and for ignoring

racial and ethnic differences among and between women. In addition, they argued that the feminist category of public and private spheres was Western-centric because it failed to consider gender differences between white women and third world women. A special 2003 issue of the *Journal of Women's History* reconsidered the continued heuristic value of the public and private categories in light of these criticisms. The scholarly consensus: the concept remains useful but needs to be re-conceptualized in light of poststructuralist thought and the criticisms of these and other third world and feminist women of color scholars. Subsequently, the concept of intersectionality—the rejection of the notion of a universal sisterhood and the acknowledgement that any analysis of women's experiences must take into account how those experiences are shaped by not only by gender, but by race, ethnicity, and class—became part of the feminist theoretical paradigm.

15 By public and private spheres, I refer to the category '60s and '70s feminist historians appropriated from the Western liberal political and legal theory canon (Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Rousseau, etc.), critiqued, and used to study a given society's (initially Western) designation of the "appropriate" societal arenas for male and female action organized in space and time. Expressed in law, religion, politics, the family, and custom, the public/private category assigned men to the public sphere and woman and children to the private sphere and included the range of norms and values proscribing and governing male and female behavior regarding sexuality and reproduction, marriage, kinship, parenthood, family roles, and participation in or exclusion from political, economic, religious, and cultural life (Boyd 1997; Joseph 1997; Davidson and Hatcher 2002; d 2003; Ryan, 2003; Scott and Keates 2004; Piepmeier 2006).

16 The following is a list of just some of the alternative institutions established in Berkeley in the '60s. Health: Volunteer doctors and nurses provided "street medicine" to the poor, to the low-income, and to needy student activists at the Berkeley Free Clinic, and the San Francisco Haight Ashbury Clinic. Food/clothing: The Berkeley Food Coop, the food conspiracy, precursors of the now well-established farmers' markets, bought food in bulk and developed ties with local farmers to circumvent high-priced supermarkets. Flea markets, Goodwill and thrift stores and consignment shops supplied clothing, household furniture, and goods. Long hair for men and women, tie-dyed shirts, indigenous peoples' jewelry, and bellbottom jeans embroidered with flowers were de rigueur hippie attire. Politicos wore Chairman Mao caps, flannel shirts, jeans without flowers, and often carried the "Little Red Book." Education: Alternate schools operating inside public schools that featured student-centered, experiential learning flourished for activists' children. Untenured university professors let go for their dissident views taught adult education on Marxism and social theory at the well-attended San Francisco and East Bay Socialist Schools. Media: Counterculture newspapers, such as the *Berkeley Tribe*, the *Berkeley Barb,* and the *San Francisco Bay Guardian*, with news about demonstrations, neighborhood happenings, and state, national, and international news about political struggles, were

distributed in stores and on street corners. Community radio stations such as KPFA filled the airwaves with alternative programming, music, and critical news. Public Space: Telegraph Avenue, Provo Park, Ho Chi Minh Park, Dolores and People's Park became well-known public gathering spots. The smell of marijuana wafted through the air. Culture: Larry Blake's Restaurant, Muddy Waters Cafe, the Albatross, the Blind Lemon, and Freight & Salvage were the places to be at night. Bill Graham's Fillmore Auditorium was the place to go to dance and hear '60s music—Bob Dylan, Phil Ochs, the Weavers, Janis Joplin, the Jefferson Airplane, Joan Baez, and the Kingston Trio, to name a few, including local favorites The Red Star Singers and Country Joe and the Fish. Cody's and Moe's in Berkeley, I.C.I A Women's Place in Oakland, and City Lights, Modern Times, China Books, and Marcus Books in San Francisco satisfied left-wing bibliophiles. City government: Organized political groups such as the Berkeley Citizens Action (BCA) ran progressive candidates for office and took over the city council, developed their own platform (the April Coalition), passed legislation for community control of the police, rent control, and elected antiwar activist Ron Dellums to the US Congress. Housing/Transportation: Groups of friends and members of political groups rented San Francisco Victorians, Berkeley's California bungalows, and Craftsmen-style housing. Their goal: to reject the model of the nuclear family and establish communes based on a belief in families based on affinity, not biology.

17 My description of my respondents' different paths to the women's movement illustrates the validity of Polletta's (2004) claims that culture is embedded in structures. Culture, in this case, refers to my respondents' civil rights, antiwar, and communist party ideologies that preceded their women's movement involvement, influenced their subsequent beliefs, and in turn, affected their practices in the women's movement.

18 "Free Spaces are public spaces in the community in which people are able to learn a new self-respect, a deeper and more assertive identity, and the value of cooperation and civic virtues." Evans and Boyte (1992: vii–xv,1–26) see free spaces as petri dishes for developing and sustaining democratic ideals and practices, civil society, social movements and social change. Based on my respondents' narrative, I believe free spaces also exist inside institutions such as Christina's interdisciplinary program, Rachel's women's studies program, and Olivia's "off-shore operation," the student-run printshop. These "free spaces" allowed my respondents to act on the basis of the shared values they brought from the women's movement, as well as giving them respite from the bureaucratic rationality they experienced in their regular working hours.

19 In "Passionate Political Processes: Bringing Emotions Back into the Study of Social Movements," constructivist Gould (2004:157) argues emotions play an important role in sustaining movements, by illuminating strategic choices, internal cultures, conflicts, and ideological cleavages. In this instance, Rachel refers to

competitive, jealous, backbiting emotions between different groups of movement women that created factions and undermined solidarity. Other examples: Olivia had a conflict with her unmarried child-free co-worker over the fact that as a mother with a child she worked less time at the print shop. "What was supposed to be equal [working hours] turned out not to be the case." Underneath debates about the strategy of "separatism" [from association with men] Christina told me that lesbian members in her organization had "moral high ground" because they no longer interacted with men.

20 Women's Studies courses on college campuses began in the late '60s. By 1971, there were 610 courses documented at 210 institutions, taught by 510 teachers. By 1974, the number of courses had grown to 4,658. In 1969, there were two Women's Studies programs. By 1974, this number had reached 112. By 1974, 500 faculty were involved (Berkowitz, Mangi, and Williamson 1974:vi–x).

21 Connell (1987) conceptualizes "gender regimes" as consisting of (1) a system that allocates skills and training, (2) gender hierarchy, (3) sexual division of labor, (4) patriarchal ideologies about femininity and masculinity, and finally (5) the cathexis, the glue that binds these elements and their embodiment in people in an organization working together. In contrast to Connell, however, my goal is to understand how the properties of gender regimes work, not to assure compliance but rather to facilitate or to constrain my respondents to translate their feminist beliefs and practice.

22 "Math anxiety" is a "state of discomfort associated with performing mathematical tasks. Among school-age children, this anxiety is stronger among girls than boys, even though their test performances are is the same. (Devine et al. 2012). Math anxiety develops in the early primary school years. Girls report less self-confidence about their mathematical abilities than boys (Goetz, Bieg, and Ludtke 2013). Research on female elementary school teachers' math anxiety levels document that teachers' anxiety levels influence students, particularly female students' math anxiety levels. This effect increases as the semester progresses as students are more exposed to their teacher's attitudes. (Bellock et al. 2010).

23 The 1964 Freedom Summer was a civil rights project was intended to make the general U.S. public aware of Mississippi's oppressive and violent treatment and disenfranchisement of blacks. College students like Trudy and Lynn went South to register black citizens to vote. For research on the impact of Freedom Summer on its participants, see McAdam (1988).

24 Marxist and socialist feminists such as Dalla Costa and James (1972), Federici (1975). Eisenstein (1978), and Hartman (1981) argued that reproductive work in the family should be considered equally and distinctly important as productive work in the economy. Hartmann (1981), DeVault (1991), Hochschild (1989, 1997), Kittay (1999), England (2005), and others labeled such work "caring work." Caring work

addresses the dependencies of the young, the aged, and the sick. Specific properties of such work include motivation by compassion rather than anticipated pecuniary gain, inadequate recognition or reward (except on Mother's Day), and association with the values of love (feeling), obligation (morality), and reciprocity (social/economic exchange). Caring work is labor-intensive and hard to standardize, and it requires face-to-face interactions (Folbre 1995).

25 The U.S. Supreme Court decriminalized abortion in the 1973 landmark Roe v. Wade case.

26 Meyer and Whittier (1994) argue for women's movement persistence by developing the concept of "social movement spillover." Spillover of movement ideas, strategies, and practices occurs when coalitions form or when activists have multiple organizational memberships. Using feminist peace movement participation as an example, Meyer and Whittier document feminist influence on the peace movement in the movement's stress on anti-leadership, anti-hierarchical practices and the juxtaposition of military violence against maternal nurturing.

27 Snow et al. (1986) quote and paraphrase Goffman's (1976:21) definition of frame. They write that ". . . frame. . . denote[s] 'schemata of interpretation' that enable individuals to 'locate, perceive, identify, and label' occurrences within their life space and the world at large. By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experiences and guide action, whether individual or collective."

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organization." *Gender and Society* 4(2):139–58.

Acker, Joan. 1992. "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21(5):565–569.

Alfano, Sean. 2005. "Poll: Women's Movement Worthwhile." CBS News, October 22, 2005. Retrieved April 10, 2019 (https://www.cbsnews.com/news/poll-womens-movement-worthwhile/).

Amenta, Edwin and Neal Caren. 2004. "The Legislative, Organizational, and Beneficiary Consequences of State-Oriented Challengers." Pp. 508–530 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements,* edited by Snow, David A., Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden: Blackwell.

Baxandall, Rosalyn, and Linda Gordon, eds. 2000. *Dear Sisters: Dispatches from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: Basic Books.

Becker's Hospital Review. 2017. "100 Hospitals and Health Systems with Great Women's Health Programs | 2017." Retrieved March 13, 2010 (https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/lists/100-hospital-health-systems-with-great-women-s-health-programs-2017.html).

Bellock, Sian L., Elizabeth A. Gunderson, Gerardo Ramirez, Susan C. Levine, and Edward E. Smith. 2010. "Female Teachers' Math Anxiety Affects Girls' Math Achievement." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)* 107(5):1860–1863.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–639.

Bengston, Vern L. 1974. "Time, Aging and Continuity of Social Structure: Themes and Issues in Generational Analysis." *Journal of Social Issues* 30(2):1–29.

Benston, Margaret. 1969. *The Political Economy of Women's Liberation*. Boston: New England Free Press.

Berger, Bennett M. 1981. *The Survival of a Counterculture: Ideological Work and Everyday Life Among Rural Communards*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berkowitz, Tamar, Jean Mangi, and Jane Williamson, eds. 1974. *Who's Who and Where in Women's Studies*. Old Westbury: Feminist Press.

Biography.com Editors. 2018. "Tarana Burke Biography." Retrieved March 10, 2019 (https://www.biography.com/people/tarana-burke).

Bowles, Gloria, and Renate Duelli Klein. 1983. *Theories of Women's Studies*. Boston: Routledge.

Blumer, Herbert. 1966. "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." *American Journal of Sociology* 71(5):535–548.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bolotin, Susan. 1982. "Voices from the Post-Feminist Generation." *The New York Times Magazine*, October 17, 1982, pp. 544, 606, 609, 610, 617, 619, 620, 716–718.

Braungart, Margaret M. 1990. "The Life-Course Development of Left- and Right-Wing Youth Activist Leaders from the 1960s." *Political Psychology* 11(2): 243–282.

Braungart, Richard. 1974. "The Sociology of Generations and Student Politics: A Comparison of the Functionalist and Generational Units Models." *Journal of Social Issues* 309(2):31–54.

Braungart, Richard, and Margaret Braungart. 1980. "Political Career Patterns of Radical Activists in the 1960s and 1970s: Some Historical Comparisons." *Sociological Focus* 13(3):237–253.

Braungart, Richard, and Margaret Braungart. 1984. "Generational Politics." *Micropolitics* 3(3):349–415.

Breines, Wini. 1988. "Whose New Left?" *Journal of American History* 75(2):528–545.

Breines, Wini. 1992. *Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Buechler, Steven. 1990. *Women's Movements in the United States: Woman Suffrage, Equal Rights, and Beyond*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Carlsson, Chris, ed. 2011. *Ten Years that Shook the City: San Francisco 1968–1978*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Caplow, Theodore, and Reece J. McGee. 2001. *The Academic Marketplace*. 2nd ed. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Cassell, Joan. 1977. *A Group Called Women: Sisterhood and Symbolism in the Feminist Movement*. New York: McKay.

Charmaz, Cathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Clark, Burton R. 1983. *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cluster, Dick, ed. 1979. *They Should Have Served That Cup of Coffee: Seven Radicals Remember the 60s*. Boston: South End Press.

CNN. 2016. "Presidential Results." Retrieved Nov. 30, 2018 (https://www.cnn.com/election/2016/results/president).

Collier, Jane, Michelle Rosaldo, and Sylvia Yanigasako. 1982. "Is There a Family: New Anthropological Views." Pp. 31–48 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom. New York: Longman.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought." *Social Problems* 33(6):S14–S32.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Social Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Combahee River Collective. 1999. "A Black Feminist Statement." Pp. 272–277 in *Feminist Theory: A Reader*, edited by Wendy K. Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1998. *The Way We Really Are: Coming to Terms with America's Changing Families*. Reprint. New York: Basic Books.

Coontz, Stephanie. 2000. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books.

Coontz, Stephanie. 2011. *Strange Stirrings: The Feminine Mystique and American Women in the Dawn of the 1960s*. New York: Basic Books.

Coontz, Stephanie, Maya Parson, and Gabrielle Raley, eds. 1999. *American Families: A Multicultural Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. 1987. "Gender Regimes and the Gender Order.*"* Pp. 116–139 in *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics.* Sidney: Allen and Unwin.

Cooley, Charles Horton. 1922. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Costain, Anne N. 1992. *Inviting Women's Rebellion: A Political Process Interpretation of the Women's Movement*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Selma James. 1972. *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. London: Falling Wall Press.

Dalton, Dan. 2014. "This is why feminism does not need rebranding." *Buzzfeed.com*. Retrieved December 7, 2018 (https://www.buzzfeed.com/danieldalton/why-feminism-tho)

Darnovsky, Marcy, Barbara Epstein, and Richard Flacks, eds. 1995. *Cultural Politics and Social Movements*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Davidson, Cathy N., and Jessamyn Hatcher. 2002. *No More Separate Spheres!* Durham: Duke University Press.

DeMartini, Joseph. R. 1985. "Change Agents and Generational Relationships: A Reevaluation of Mannheim's Problem of Generations." *Social Forces* 64(1):1–16.

Denzin, Norman K. 1989. *Interpretive Biography*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

DeSilver, Drew. 2018. "A Record Number of Women Will Be Serving in the New Congress." *FactTank*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved April 10, 2019 (https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/12/18/record-number-women-in-congress/).

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis." *Social Problems* 37(1):96–116.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the Family: The Social Construction of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1996. "Talking Back to Sociology: Distinctive Contributions of Feminist Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:29–50.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1999. *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Devine, Amy, Kayleigh Fawcett, Dénes Szücs, and Ann Dowker. 2012. "Gender Differences in Mathematics Anxiety and the Relation to Mathematics Performance While Controlling for Test Anxiety." *Brain and Behavior Functions* 8(1):33–41.

Dizard, Jan E., and Howard Gadlin. 1990. *The Minimal Family*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2002. *Outlaw Woman: A Memoir of the War Years, 1960–1975*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Dubois, Ellen Carol, Gail Paradise Kelly, Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy, Carolyn W. Korsemeyer, and Lillian S. Robinson. 1985. *Feminist Scholarship: Kindling in the Groves of Academe.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

DuPlessis, Rachel Blau, and Ann Barr Snitow. 1998. *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices From Women's Liberation*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Echols, Alice. 1989. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967–1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Eisinger, Peter. K. 1973. "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities." *American Political Science Review* 67(1):11–28.

Eisenstein, Zillah R., ed. 1978. *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

England, Paula. 2005. "Emerging Theories of Care Work. *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:381–399.

Evans, Sara. 1979. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights and the New Left*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Evans, Sara. 2003. *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Evans, Sara M., and Harry C. Boyte. 1992. *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The Undeclared War on American Women*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Faludi, Susan. 1991a. "Blame it on Feminism: What's Wrong with Women Today?— Too Much Equality." *Mother Jones*. Sept./Oct., pp. 21–30.

Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages Against Housework.* Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Fendrich, J. M. 1974. "Activists Ten Years Later: A Test of Generational Unit Continuity." *Journal of Social Issues* 30(3):75–118.

Fendrich, J. M. 1977. "Keeping the Faith or Pursuing the Good Life: A Study of the Consequences of Participation in the Civil Rights Movement." *American Sociological Review* 42(1):144–157.

Fendrich, J. M. 1993 "African-American and White Activists Twenty-Five Years Later." Pp. 119–132 in *Ideal Citizens: The Legacy of the Civil Rights Movement*. New York: SUNY Press.

Fendrich, J. M., and A. T. Tarleau. 1973. "Marching to a Different Drummer: Occupational and Political Correlates of Former Student Activists." *Social Forces* 52(2):235-253.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Patricia Yancey Martin. 1995. *Feminist Organizations: The Harvest of the Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fields, Jason. 2004. *America's Family and Living Arrangements: 2003*. Current Population Survey Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved Nov.15, 2018 (https://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p20-553.pdf)

Fine, Michelle. 1994. "Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self in Qualitative Research." Pp. 70–82 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Finer, Laurence B. 2007. "Trends in Premarital Sex in the United States 1954–2003." *Public Health Reports.* Retrieved Jan. 10, 2019 (https://www.ncbi.nim.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1802108/)

Firestone, Shulamith. 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Bantam Books.

Flacks, Richard. 1967. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." *Journal of Social Issues* 23(3):52–75.

Flacks, Richard. 1971. *Youth and Social Change*. Chicago: Markham Publishing.

Flacks, Richard. 1988. *Making History: The American Left and the American Mind*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Folbre, Nancy. 1995. "'Holding Hands at Midnight': The Paradox of Caring Labor." *Feminist Economics* 1(1):73–92.

Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: New Press.

Fonow, Mary Margaret, and Judith A. Cook. 1991. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Foss, Daniel A., and Ralph W. Larkin. 1976. "From 'The Gates of Eden' to 'Day of the Locust': An Analysis of the Dissident Youth Movement of the 1960s and Its Heirs of the Early 1970s" *Theory and Society* 3(1):45–64.

Freeman, Jo. 1972. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 17: 151–164.

Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process*. New York: McKay.

Freeman, Jo. N.d. "The March for Women's Lives." Retrieved Nov. 29, 2018 (https://www.jofreeman.com/photos/MFWL.html).

Friedan, Betty. 1963. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton.

Friedan, Betty. 1977. *It Changed My Life: Writings on the Women's Movement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Friedson, Elliot. 1970. *Professional Dominance*. Chicago: Aldine.

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, ILL: Dorsey Press.

Gamson, William A. 1992. "The Social Psychology of Collective Action." Pp. 53–77 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gerson, Kathleen. 1985. *Hard Choices: How Women Decide About Work, Career, and Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gitlin, Todd. 1987. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, Thomas, Madeline Bieg, and Oliver Ludtke. 2013. "Do Girls Really Experience More Anxiety in Mathematics?" *Psychological Science* 24(10):2079–2087.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper. 2004. "Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory." Pp. 3–30 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gould, Deborah B. 2004. "Passionate Political Processes: Bringing Emotions Back into the Study of Social Movements." Pp. 155–176 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gould, Deborah B. 2009. *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gluck, Sherna Berger and Daphne Patai, eds. 1991. *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haber, Barbara. 1979. "Is Personal Life Still a Political Issue?" *Feminist Studies* 5(3):417–31.

Hansen, Karen V., and Ilene J. Philipson, eds. 1990. *Women, Class, and the Feminist Imagination: A Socialist Feminist Reader*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1987. *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. 6th ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1993. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology." Pp. 49–82 in *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by Linda Martin Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1983. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." Pp. 283–305 in *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, edited by Sandra G. Harding and Merrill B. Hintikka. Dortrecht: Reidel Publishing.

Hartmann, Heidi I. 1981. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union." *Education and the State* 1:165–196.

Hartmann, Heidi. 2003. "The Unhappy Marriage Between Marxism and Feminism." Pp. 206–221 in *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, edited by Carole Ruth McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim. New York: Routledge.

Hayden, Tom. 1988. *Reunion: A Memoir*. New York: Random House.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, and Patricia Lina Leavy. 2007. *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Hewlett, Sylvia. 1986. A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation in America. New York: William Morrow.

Hickey, Cherly. 1991. "Feminism—The New "F" Word?" *Women's Writes* (Newsletter, Women's Resources and Research Center University of California, Davis). Fall, pp. 1,4–5.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Penguin Books.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Holt.

Hoge, D. R., and T. L. Ankney. 1982. "Occupations and Attitudes of Former Student Activists 10 Years Later." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 11(5):355–371.

Hsieh, Chang-Tai, Eri Hurst, Charles I. Jones, and Peter J. Klenow. 2012. "The Allocation of Talent and U.S. Economic Growth." Palo Alto: Stanford University. Retrieved December 1, 2018 (*https://web.stanford.edu/~chadj/talent090.pdf*).

Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds. 1982. *All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Old Westbury: Feminist Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9:527–553.

Johnson, Kathryn K. 1979. "Durkheim Revisited: Why Do Women Kill Themselves?" *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 9(3):145–152.

Johnson, Kathryn, and Peggy Somers. 1972. *Behind Every Sexist Stands the Boss. The Political Economy of Sexism*. Position Paper. Berkeley, CA: New American Movement.

Johnston, Hank. 2014. *What is a Social Movement?* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Jong, Erica. 1994. *Fear of Fifty: A Midlife Memoir.* New York: Harper Collins.

Joseph, Suad. 1997. "The Public/Private—The Imagined Boundary in the Imagined Nation/State/Community: The Lebanese Case." *Feminist Review* 57:73–92.

Kaminer, Wendy. 1993. "Feminism's Identity Crisis." *Atlantic Monthly*. October pp. 51–68.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1990. "Feminism Within American Institutions: Unobtrusive Mobilization in the 1980s. *Signs* 16(1):27–54.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1998. *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest Inside the Church and the Military*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kauffman, L. A. 2018. *How to Read a Protest: The Art of Organizing and Resistance.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kirsch, Gesa E. 1999. *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research: The Politics of Location, Interpretation, and Publication*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Kittay, Eva Feder. 1999. "Introduction." Pp. 1–19 in *Love's Labor: Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency*. New York: Routledge.

Klandermans, Bert. 1986. "New Social Movements and Resource Mobilization: The European and the American Approach." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 4(2):13–39.

Klandermans, Bert, and Dirk Oegema. 1987. "Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements." *American Journal of Sociology* 52(4):519–531.

Klatch, Rebecca E. 1999. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, The New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kurzman, Charles. 2004. "The Poststructuralist Consensus in Social Movement Theory." Pp. 111–120 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Landes, Joan B. 2003. "Further Thoughts on the Public/Private Distinction." *Journal of Women's History* 15(2):28–39.

Laraña, Enrique, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, eds. 1994. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Laslett, Barbara. 1999. "Review: Personal Narratives as Sociology." *Contemporary Sociology* 28(4):391–401.

Laslett, Barbara, and Barrie Thorne, eds. 1997. *Feminist Sociology: Life Histories of a Movement*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Livingston, Gretchen. 2014. "Fewer Than Half of U.S. Kids Today Live in a 'Traditional' Family." *FactTank*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved April 10, 2019 (https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/12/22/less-than-half-of-u-s-kids-today-live-in-a-traditional-family/)

Lofland, John, and Lyn Lofland. 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. 3rd ed. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Love, Barbara J., ed. 2006. *Feminists Who Changed America: 1963–1975*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

McAdam, Doug, 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92(1):65–90.

McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McAdam, Doug. 1989. "The Biographical Consequences of Activism." *American Sociological Review* 54(5):744–760.

McAdam, Doug. 1992. "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 97(5):1211–1240.

McAdam, Doug. 2004. "Revisiting the U.S. Civil Rights Movement: Towards a More Synthetic Understanding of the Sources of Contention." Pp. 201–232 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

McAdam, Doug, and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. "Specifying the Relationship Between Social Ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3):640-667.

McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy, and Meyer Zald. 1996. "Introduction." Pp. 1–23 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy, and Meyer Zald. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McIntosh, Peggy. 1988. *White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies*. Wellesley: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

Maidenberg, Michael, and Philip Meyer. 1970. "The Berkeley Rebels Five Years Later: Has Age Mellowed the Pioneer Radicals?" Seven-part series, Detroit Free Press (February 1–7)

Mannheim, Karl. 1952. "The Problem of Generations." Pp. 276–322 in *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Paul Kecskemeti. London: Routledge.

Mansbridge, Jane. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mansbridge, Jane, and Aldon Morris. 2001. *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marcus, Jon. 2017. "Why Men Are the New College Minority." *Atlantic Monthly* 8(8). Retrieved Nov. 30, 2018 (https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/08/why-men-are-the-new-college-minority/536103/)

Martinez, Elizabeth. 1989. "Histories of 'The Sixties': A Certain Absence of Color." *Social Justice* 16(4):175–184.

Marwell, G., M. T. Aiken, and N. J. Demerath. 1987. "The Persistence of Political Attitudes Among 1960s Civil Rights Activists." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(3):359–375.

Maynes, Mary Jo, Jennifer L. Pierce, and Barbara Laslett. 2008. *Telling Stories: The Use of Personal Narratives in the Social Sciences and History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*, edited by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Melucci, Alberto. 1980. "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach." *Social Science Information* 19(2):199–226.

Meyer, David S., and Debra Minkoff. 2004. "Conceptualizing Political Opportunity." *Social Forces* 2(4):1457–1492.

Meyer, David S., and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41(2):277–298.

Millet, Kate. 1970. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Avon.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mitchell, Juliet. 1972. *Women's Estate*. New York: Pantheon.

Moraga, Cherrie, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 1983. *This Bridge Called My Back*. New York: Kitchen Table Press.

Morgan, Robin, ed. 1970. *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: Vintage Books.

Morgan, Robin. 1977. *Going Too Far: The Personal Chronicles of a Feminist*. New York: Random House.

Morris, Aldon D., and Carol McClurg Mueller, eds. 1992. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mueller, Carol McClurg. 1992. "Building Social Movement Theory." Pp. 3–26 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nagel, Ernest. 1962. "The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation." *Philosophy* 37(142):372–374.

Nassi, A. J., and S. I. Abramowitz. 1978." Transition or Transformation? Personal and Political Development of Former Berkeley Free Speech Movement Activists." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 8(1):21–35.

O'Reilly, Jane, 1971. "The Housewife's Moment of Truth." *Ms.* (Spring) Reprinted in *The First Ms. Reader*, edited by Francine Klagsbrun. 1973. New York: Warner Books.

Oakley, Ann. 1974. *The Sociology of Housework.* New York: Pantheon.

Orcutt, James, and James Fendrich.1980. Students' Perceptions on the Decline of Protest: Evidence from the Early '70s." *Sociological Focus* 13(3):203–213.

Park, Andrea. 2017. "#MeToo reaches 85 countries with 1.7M tweets." CBS News, October 24, 2017. Retrieved Nov. 30, 2018 (https://www.cbsnews.com/news/metoo-reaches-85-countries-with-1-7-million-tweets/).

Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System.* Glencoe: Free Press.

Patten, Eileen, and Kim Parker. 2011. "Women in the U.S. Military: Growing Share,` Distinctive Profile." Pew Research Center. Retrieved February 10, 2019 (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2011/12/women-in-the-military.pdf).

Payne, Stanley Le Baron. 1951. *The Art of Asking Questions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Personal Narratives Group. 1989. "Truths." Pp. 261–267 in *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narrative*, edited by Joy Webster Barbre. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pew Research Center. 2013. "Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family. Retrieved July 13, 2019. (https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/03/14/modern-parenthood-roles-of-moms-and-dads-converge-as-they-balance-work-and-family/)

Piepmeier, Alison. "Stepping Out: Rethinking the Public and Private Spheres." 2006. *Journal of Women's History* 18(3):128–137.

Plummer, Kenneth. 2001. *Documents of Life: An Invitation to a Critical Humanism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Polletta, Francesca. 2004. "Culture is Not Just in Your Head." Pp. 97–110 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Polletta, Francesca. 2004a. "Friendship and Equality in the Women's Liberation Movement 1967–77." Pp. 149–175 in *Freedom is an Endless Meeting:*

Democracy in American Social Movements. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Povich, Lynn. 2012. *The Good Girls Revolt: How the Women of Newsweek Sued Their Boss and Changed the Workplace*. New York: Public Affairs Perseus Group.

Reger, Jo. 2001. "Motherhood and the Construction of Feminist Identities: Variation in Women's Movement Organizations." *Sociological Inquiry* 71(1):85–110.

Reger, Jo, and Verta Taylor. 2002. "Women's Movement Research and Social Movement Theory: A Symbiotic Relationship." *Research in Political Sociology* 10:85–121.

Reinarman, Craig. 1987. *American States of Mind: Political Beliefs and Behavior Among Private and Public Workers*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Reinharz, Shulamit, and Lynn Davidman. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reynolds, Michael, Shobha Shagle, and Lekha Venkataraman. 2007. "A National Census of Women's and Gender Studies Programs in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education." National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago. Retrieved December 10, 2018 (https://www.nwsa.org/Files/Resources/NWSA_CensusonWSProgs.pdf).

Rich, Adrienne. 1986. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." Pp. 23–75 in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979–1985*. New York: Norton.

Rosen, Ruth. 2000. *The World Split Open: How the Women's Movement Changed America*. New York: Viking.

Rosen, Ruth. 2007. "The Care Crisis." *The Nation*, March 12, 2007 issue. (https://www.thenation.com/article/care-crisis/)

Rowbotham, Sheila. 1974. *Woman's Consciousness, Man's World*. New York: Penguin.

Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, Mary R. 2003. "The Public and Private Good." *Journal of Women's History* 15(2):11–27.

Salholz, Eloise, and Renee Michael, Mark Starr, Shawn Doherty, Pamela Abramson, and Pat Wingert. 1986. "Too Late for Prince Charming." *Newsweek.* June 2, pp. 54–57, 61.

Saltzman, Amy. 1991. "Trouble at the Top: A U.S. Survey Says a 'Glass Ceiling' Blocks Women from Corporate Heights. New Critics Say it's Time for Women to Re-Examine their Goals." *U.S. News & World Report* June 17, pp. 41–48.

Sayej, Nadja. 2017. "Alyssa Milano and the #MeToo Movement." *The Guardian*, Dec. 1. theguardian.com. Retrieved December 7, 2018 (https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2017/dec/01/alyssa-milano-mee-too-sexual-harassment-abuse).

Scott, Joan Wallach, and Debra Keates, eds. 2004. *Going Public: Feminism and the Shifting Boundaries of the Private Sphere*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sherkat, Darren E., and T. Jean Blocker. 1997. "Explaining the Political and Personal Consequences of Protest." *Social Forces* 75(3):1049–70.

Shreve, Anita. 1989. *Women Together, Women Alone: The Legacy of the Consciousness-Raising Movement*. New York: Viking.

Skolnick, Arlene S. and Jerome H. Skolnick. 1992. *Family in Transition: Rethinking Marriage, Sexuality, Child Rearing, and Family Organization*. 7th ed. New York: Harper Collins.

Smeal, Eleanor. 1997. "From Gender Gap to Gender Gulf: Abortion, Affirmative Action, and the Radical Right." Speech presented at the National Press Club, February 13, Washington, DC.

Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher, Jr., and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1980. "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociological Review* 45(5):787–801.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464–481.

Sommers, Christine Hoff. 1994. *Who Stole Feminism*? New York: Simon and Schuster.

Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1988. "Introduction." Pp. 1–17 in *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Staggenborg, Suzanne, and Josée Lecomte. 2009. "Social Movement Campaigns: Mobilization and Outcomes in the Montreal Women's Movement Community." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 14(2):163-180.

Staggenborg, Suzanne, and Verta Taylor. 2005. "Whatever Happened to The Women's Movement?" *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 10(1):37–52.

Tanner, Leslie B., ed. 1970. *Voices from Women's Liberation.* New York: New American Library.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2004. "Paradigm Warriors Regress and Progress in the Study of Contentious Politics." Pp. 39–47 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. "The Powers of Movement" and "Cycles of Protest.*"* Pp. 81–170 in *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Verta. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54(5):761–775.

Taylor, Verta, and Leila J. Rupp. 1993. "Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism." *Signs* 19(1):32–61.

Taylor, Verta. 2010. "Culture, Identity, and Social Movements: Studying Social Movements as if People Really Matter." *Mobilization* 15(2):113–134.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, Charles. 1999. "From Interactions to Outcomes." Pp. 253–270 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Guigni, Marco, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2004. "Wise Quacks." Pp. 31–38 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Washburn, Jennifer. 2005. *University, Inc: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Whalen, Jack, and Richard Flacks.1980. "The Isla Vista 'Bank Burners' Ten Years Later: Notes on the Fate of Student Activists." *Sociological Focus* 13(3): 215–36.

Whalen, Jack, and Richard Flacks. 1989. *Beyond the Barricades: The Sixties Generation Grows Up*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wolf, Diane L., ed. *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. 1996. Boulder: Westview Press.

Yates, Gayle Graham. 1975. *What Women Want: The Ideas of the Movement*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Zald, Mayer N., and John D. McCarthy. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movement.* Cambridge, Mass: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

Zaretsky, Eli. 1973. *Capitalism, the Family, and Personal Life*. New York: Harper Colophon.

Zinn, Maxine Baca, and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 2003. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." Pp. 353–362 in *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, edited by Carole Ruth McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim. New York: Routledge.