



POWER FOR WHAT?

Women's Leadership:

Why Should You Care?

POWER FOR WHAT?

Women's Leadership:
Why Should You Care?



Published by
Institute for Women's Leadership
Consortium at Douglass College
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

THE INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP is a six-member consortium dedicated to examining leadership issues and advancing women's leadership in education, research, politics, the workplace, and the world. Established in 1991 on the Douglass College campus at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, the institute brings together internationally recognized centers with Douglass College to develop new research, teaching, and public service initiatives. Consortium members include:

Douglass College
Department of Women's and Gender Studies
Center for American Women and Politics,
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Center for Women's Global Leadership
Center for Women and Work, School of Management
and Labor Relations
Institute for Research on Women

This comprehensive set of units, devoted to women's lives and linked in a consortium, represents a distinctive national resource and a model for innovation in higher education. The institute draws on the talents of faculty in the arts and sciences and in the professional schools at Rutgers as well as community leaders, policy makers, and researchers to explore issues of concern to women and families.



In 2000, the institute began a **NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON EDUCATING WOMEN FOR LEADERSHIP** to provide a forum for sharing information and exploring progress. The National Dialogue is the subject of this series of occasional papers.

Pictured on the cover are the four conference speakers. Standing from left to right: Helen Caldicott, Susan J. Carroll, Charlotte Bunch, and seated, Deborah Gray White.

PREFACE

The papers presented here are from a panel discussion titled *Power for What? Women's Leadership: Why Should You Care?* held on April 24, 2001, at the Institute for Women's Leadership at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. In this second publication in the series *National Dialogue on Educating Women for Leadership*, four eminent spokeswomen examine the issue of women's leadership through their own disciplinary lenses in human rights, history, political science, and medicine. They take up key questions about women's leadership. Do women lead differently than men? Why should we care about women's leadership? What is decision-making power? Should women claim it and for what purposes should they seek it? What is needed to take women's leadership to the next stage?

The panel highlights three Rutgers scholars and a visiting scholar: Charlotte Bunch, director of the Center for Women's Global Leadership and professor in the Department of Women's and Gender Studies; Deborah Gray White, professor and chair of the Department of History; Susan J. Carroll, professor of political science and senior research associate at the Center for American Women and Politics at the Eagleton Institute of Politics; and Australian author and pediatrician Helen Caldicott, occupant of the Laurie New Jersey Chair in Women's Studies at Douglass College in spring 2001. The panel is introduced by Mary S. Hartman, director of the Institute for Women's Leadership at Rutgers, historian, and former dean of Douglass College.

The authors of these papers agree that there are powerful and compelling arguments for why women's leadership makes a difference and why we should care about the dearth of women in leadership positions, both in the United States and globally. First, they argue that women's leadership can be a vital source of change in a world that desperately needs it. "The world needs women to take more leadership," Charlotte Bunch states. "Women at this moment in history bring new perspectives and values to the table that can revitalize and transform debates and options in a globe that

is threatened with self-destruction based on past — predominantly male — leadership.” Helen Caldicott’s perspective as a physician deeply concerned about environmental degradation and the threat of nuclear war leads her to believe that “women hold the key to the future We actually hold creation in the palm of our hands,” she asserts. “We are about to destroy it. The only solution that I can see, the only solution that has never been tried, is that women take over.”

The second reason we should care about women’s leadership, the panelists demonstrate, is that women bring something different to the leadership table: they make different kinds of leaders than men. Using the perspective of politics, Susan Carroll argues that women are different political leaders than men because they feel a special responsibility to represent women and their interests. They have a different angle of vision, based not on biology, but on their differing life experiences and social roles. Drawing on interviews done by the Center for American Women and Politics with women who served in the 103rd and 104th Congresses, Carroll states, “Regardless of whether the issue is foreign aid, the budget, or the environment, women public officials frequently examine the issue through a gendered lens, and consequently more often think about the possible impact of the policy on the lives of women and children.” In other words, the presence of women in political office makes a difference in public policy. Bunch agrees that there is a difference to women’s leadership, describing it as more “cooperative,” “integrated,” and “holistic.” “Women’s experiences generally bring the public and the private together more than do men’s, and women usually have had to work in a way that sees how things are interconnected there is a pattern to suggest that women have a more inclusive view of the need for bringing everyone into the process,” she writes.

The scholars and activists highlighted here agree, however, on the need to consider both definitions and underlying motivations when discussing women’s leadership. Charlotte Bunch points out the importance of being precise and contextual when we define this term. “There is not just one type of ‘women’s leadership,’” she

argues. “The context in which one is talking about which women taking leadership on which issues in which arena and country and at which moment in time is also important.” Leadership, in her view, “involves making something happen in affecting how something is done or viewed in the world — large or small. Leadership is both about individuals who take initiative and it is about the collective capacity of a group — whether a community, movement, organization, or nation — to create change.”

The reasons women seek and assume leadership are important to consider, as Deborah Gray White demonstrates. How much is it for personal advancement, how much for larger causes like racial advancement or social justice? In the early twentieth century, she states, middle-class African-American women were expected to be leaders, and chose careers with the idea of being “race women” — leaders and representatives of the race. Today, in a different historical context where racism is not as overt, individual middle-class black women’s career options and leadership opportunities have expanded dramatically, while black women’s collective organizations have lost their vitality and strength. “Today, black women lead in every aspect of American life,” she writes, “and self-satisfaction is a major reward of that leadership. Ironically however, it’s not all progress. Although there are probably more black women leaders now than ever before, it is also true that black women have fewer leaders than ever before.”

Finally, this dialogue makes clear that we should also care about women’s leadership for reasons of democracy and justice. Women, after all, are more than half of the world’s population, as Helen Caldicott declares: “Women hold up 53 percent of the sky, and it is inappropriate that we allow the men to run the world.... All political policies are fundamentally about women’s issues.” Women’s lives are impacted by leadership decisions — whether these decisions are about welfare legislation, health care legislation, or foreign policy — and their voices should be part of the process. “Representation,” Charlotte Bunch points out, “is a fundamental matter of democracy and justice. Even if having more women in recognized

leadership at all levels of society did not make a difference in policy, we can't claim to have democracy in this country and most of the world when the representation of people in power is so skewed toward men."

What might it require to take women's leadership to the next stage? Dogged persistence, passion, a collective rather than individualistic vision, structural changes that encourage and validate women's participation in leadership, female-defined models of leadership, leadership education, and a critical mass of women in decision-making positions in the public sphere are all vital components, according to this panel. In her introduction, Mary Hartman describes the kinds of questions the panel will address as "*the* critical set of issues in the subject area of women's leadership." Defining women's leadership as a subject area — one in need of research and dialogues like this — is itself an important step forward.

Mary K. Trigg
Director, Leadership Scholars Program
Institute for Women's Leadership

MARY S. HARTMAN
is university
professor and
director of
the Institute
for Women's
Leadership at
Douglass College,
Rutgers University.



elcome to the Institute for Women's Leadership and to the second in our annual series titled *National Dialogue on Educating Women for Leadership*. Our first panel in 2000 addressed the question of whether leaders are made or born — an obviously important question for anyone engaged in leadership education, including all six members of our institute consortium! At that first session, we featured participants from outstanding leadership programs for college women as well as an eminent scholar widely known for her work on the experience and achievements of women graduates from single-sex and coeducational institutions.¹ The presentations were followed by a lively discussion with our audience and the session that awaits you this afternoon promises to be equally spirited and engaging. Our panelists today all enjoy national — even international — reputations, but this time they come to us from closer to home. All currently hold appointments at Rutgers and are affiliated with the Institute for Women's Leadership, although our visiting scholar Helen Caldicott will soon be returning to Australia where she plans to run for national office.

The four extraordinary women on today's panel are superbly qualified to address what many would agree is *the* critical set of issues in the subject area of women's leadership. Our title puts it bluntly: "Power for What? Women's Leadership: Why Should You Care?" From their different disciplinary and activist perspectives, Charlotte Bunch, Susan Carroll, Deborah Gray White, and Helen Caldicott will share with you their views on why it should matter to everyone that women are equally represented with men in all the forums where policy is being made that influences our daily lives. They will also explain why this is an especially critical historical moment to promote more women in leadership, to

create a more positive climate for women leaders, and to ensure that colleges and universities work more consciously to encourage women — now the majority of college students in this country — to assume leadership responsibilities.

I got a preview of what is in store for you in a planning session with our speakers where two things became clear. First, all contended that whether it owes more to genes or to experience — and they don't agree on that issue, by the way — women bring special things to leadership that are critically needed in today's world. Second, contrary to widespread opinion out there, none of these speakers takes for granted that the steady, if slow, increase of women in positions of leadership that we have seen in recent decades is bound to continue or, for that matter, that it represents a totally positive development.

As many of you know, in developed countries such as the United States, the upward trajectory in the numbers of women leaders in both the public and private sectors has lately begun to level off. In the U.S. Congress, for example, women's representation appears to be evening out at around 13 percent. Not only is this a long way from equality, it is a good distance from the 25 to 30 percent that is usually defined as the critical mass necessary to enable women or any minority in an institution to make a real difference in the decision-making process. Outside the political arena, moreover, the percentages of women in top positions are often even lower. In the U.S. corporate world, for example, despite significant growth among middle and even upper-level managers, women CEOs continue to be less than one percent among Fortune 500 companies; and everywhere the pace of women's movement into top posts has slowed demonstrably since the mid-1990s.

Some analysts are beginning to suspect that this "plateauing" of the numbers of women in high-level positions is owing to the combined effects of a defensive closing of the uppermost ranks — as women have increasingly moved into the lower and middling ones — and the continuing handicaps of women's disproportionate family and household responsibilities. Women — especially in developed societies — may in fact now be reaching the outer limits of the

familiar set of individual accommodations that have so far enabled so many of them to enter the workforce while allowing only small numbers to compete successfully for the highest positions. Most working women at all levels, after all, have already had to make personal adjustments that their male counterparts have not been obliged to make. The higher up they go, the more they are obliged to deal with the contradictions inherent in positions that were designed for what economist Eileen Appelbaum calls the “unencumbered worker,” namely the worker who is presumed to have someone at home minding any responsibilities beyond the job.

In practice, this has meant that women who would rise in such settings have often decided to give up or postpone marriage, or perhaps wait to pursue careers until children were grown or they themselves were widows. More typically, women have foregone children, postponed them, or had fewer than they really wanted, while those with children have regularly surrendered huge chunks of their incomes for childcare. The stalling in the movement of women to the top, then, may finally reflect not the incapacity of more than a handful of women to lead, which critics often charge, but instead the limits of the individual solutions to which women still must resort to address a collective problem.

The plateauing of women in top leadership, in other words, may simply mean that there is no more “give” possible on their side in a world where women are still the ones expected to assume primary domestic responsibility and where men still get celebrated for merely “helping out” at home. Meanwhile, institutions of all sorts that rest upon an ideal employee who turns out to be an unencumbered male worker have yet to step up to the plate in a serious way. It is time, say some commentators, to stop expecting women to change — women have already stretched to the limits their capacities in that area — and to start demanding more change from the institutions, public and private, that continue to guard and defend their tilted playing fields. Then and only then, these analysts argue, will women break through to achieve the equal positions in leadership that they deserve and that the whole world needs.

It may be, of course, that regardless of what happens in these formal leadership settings, the more critical future developments in women's leadership will turn out to be the ones that are already underway in less visible arenas of informal leadership where, as Charlotte Bunch will surely point out in framing today's discussion, women have always led. At the present time, she sees that women all over the world are experiencing new opportunities for expanded leadership, in contexts both informal and formal, as a result of novel crises on the global scene. These crises are drawing on women's established capacity for acting across boundaries of race, class, and ethnicity to mediate conflicts and to create new possibilities for transforming power. Bunch surely agrees with Helen Caldicott in arguing that at a time when the globe is threatened with self-destruction, much of it owing to past — predominately male — approaches to leadership, we could do far worse than appeal to female leadership; and we might even do better.

The work Susan Carroll presents on political leadership already shows, after all, that women actually do behave differently as leaders; at least in recent times. She explains that most women take seriously a special responsibility to represent women and their interests, and that such advocacy has had demonstrable results in legislation and public policy. Women elected officials tend, for example, to work more readily across party lines on many issues, and to display a more inclusive approach to government, one that is more responsive to the needs and interest of all citizens.

I mentioned earlier that our commentators recognize that not all the effects of the recent rise in the numbers of women leaders have been positive. Deborah Gray White, who will be surveying the twentieth-century history of middle-class black women in leadership, has some sobering reminders that for today's black women, the downside to an increase in their numbers in leadership ranks has been the weakening of advocacy organizations in support of black women. Earlier in the twentieth century, she reports, educated black women were trained to think and act more broadly in behalf of their race and to be "race leaders" regardless of any specific careers they

pursued. Now, although there are significantly more black women leaders in many more fields than ever before, black women themselves have fewer leaders they can call their own.

White explains this apparent paradox by noting that once the more virulent forms of racism in this country began to be reduced, the black organizations that had literally educated middle-class black women to be “race leaders” saw their influence diminish. Her insightful analysis is critical, I think, not only in understanding the current position of black women but in explaining the peculiarly isolated situation today of all women in leadership. To the extent that women have succeeded in entering the many public and private arenas still largely controlled by men, they have often been perceived, and encouraged to perceive themselves, as living proof that institutionalized sexism, and racism as well, are things of the past. What we are beginning to realize in addressing the many issues around women in leadership is the continuing strength of the largely unchallenged structural barriers to women and people of color that remain embedded in institutions that still get away with presenting themselves as gender and race neutral.

Helen Caldicott frames her own analysis of the need for women's leadership around what she sees as the most profound threat to the earth in a U.S.-led revival of the cold war and a revived attention to Star Wars. Hers was the most passionate voice on behalf of nuclear freeze in the 1980s; and her message now, more clearly than before, is that “women hold the key to the future” in addressing what she sees as the impending global crisis around nuclear weapons. Whichever arguments for women's leadership we find most compelling, it will be difficult after this session to embrace complacency that women's leadership will simply expand of its own momentum or to contend that women's leadership will not make a difference. All our speakers give reasons for women and men alike to recognize a new urgency to promote women in leadership. As Charlotte Bunch puts it: “Our challenge is to take women's leadership to the next step. Women must do more than just clean up the messes male leaders have made in the world and challenge their

policies; we must come up with alternative proposals and ways of operating that might lead the world to a different place.”

Note: The program in which these panelists participated took place before the tragic events of September 11, 2001. It is nonetheless striking to note that their answers to the question of why we should care about women’s leadership resonate even more strongly in light of those events. Ensuring that women are equally represented in all forums where decisionmaking takes place, whether local or global, is not only the fair and just thing to do, although it is surely that. Nor is it simply a way of ensuring that different points of view are brought to the table, although it is that too. But beyond these things, working to guarantee that women participate equally with men in leadership is nothing less than a critical way to help secure our collective survival.

1 The papers were published in 2001 as the first volume in the series *National Dialogue on Educating Women for Leadership*. This volume, “Are Leaders Made or Born?” can be ordered by contacting the Institute for Women’s Leadership at 162 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 08901, or through our web site, <http://iwl.rutgers.edu>.

CHARLOTTE BUNCH
is executive director
for the Center for
Women's Global
Leadership at
Douglass College,
Rutgers University.



What are we talking about when we say women's leadership?

I agreed to start this panel with reflections on what we are talking about when we say “women’s leadership.” This is a complex question that can be approached from different angles. But the first point to be clear about is whether one is talking about any women who take leadership in any field or about a particular political perspective, that is feminist, on leadership. Both are important subjects, but often the two get mixed up, and this can cause confusion. Sometimes we say women’s leadership when we are really talking about feminist perspectives on leadership, and then we should name it as such. Other times we are talking about women as leaders and what that reveals more generally, but then we must also be clear that this is a very contextual question. There is not just one type of “women’s leadership.” The context in which one is talking about which women taking leadership on which issues in which arena and country and at which moment in time is also important.

Much of women’s leadership over the centuries has been invisible because the question of leadership has been viewed from a traditional gender bias of male-defined models and assumptions about what was important and where leadership was happening — usually only acknowledged in the public sphere. Ironically, even some of the feminist critique of leadership has reinforced this male bias because it often identifies the term “leadership” only with domination and authoritarian models, and therefore tends to reject the very concept as “anti-feminist.” Thus some feminists have also failed to see other ways that leadership is being exercised, even or especially, by women.

There have always been some women taking leadership somewhere. Often women leading or seeking to lead are confined to the family or local community's "private sphere," but nonetheless they are exercising leadership. Women have been resolving conflicts and finding solutions to community problems. They have been pulling people together to make something happen, whether that is getting a street light at the corner to prevent children from being hit by cars or working to defeat the building of nuclear power plants. Women are always making priorities (hard choices), and stretching tight budgets. For example, when one looks at what women do in situations of armed conflict, there is usually a process of some women taking the responsibility of holding families together, helping the community to survive, and talking across ethnic lines that pride often prevents men from doing. Yet this leadership is often invisible at the formal level.

The problem is that women have often not had the power and formal recognition that went with the tasks that they were doing. So the question of acknowledging what women are doing and giving it more attention and power is central to women's leadership. We need to look at how to move women leaders into a position of more power and impact on the world; how to move the leadership that women take, the ideas and experiences that women have into the public sphere in a more forceful way; and how to give women more recognition, more power, and more opportunity to influence the public sphere. The problem is not that women haven't been leading, it is that they haven't been allowed to lead in enough of the public arenas where decisions are made that determine the larger context of all our lives.

In looking at women's leadership, we need to recognize that there are many different types, styles, and arenas of leadership. Often our images of leadership are narrow — focusing only on the elected political person or the charismatic advocate who rides off on a horse and "saves" everybody. But there are many kinds of leaders. Public advocates and politicians are perhaps the most visible, and that type of power is important for feminist goals to progress. But

there is also organizational leadership; leadership in managing institutions and moving forward various structures of our society. There is intellectual leadership; artistic, cultural, and spiritual leadership; technical and scientific leadership; etc. There are many varieties of leadership in different places and for different purposes. Often what a leader does is also determined not only by personality but by the opportunities she has and by the community she lives in and its needs — all of which affect what is seen as most important and possible to do.

Are Leaders Born or Made?

Whatever the field and style of a leader, leadership involves making something happen or affecting how something is done or viewed in the world — large or small. Leadership is both about individuals who take initiative and about the collective capacity of a group — whether a community, movement, organization, or nation — to create change. But even for collective leadership to emerge, there are individuals who take leadership either alone and/or together to make it happen. So who are these leaders? Are they born or made? The debate over whether leaders are born or made is perhaps most important to those who work in the leadership development business like us, but I think that leaders are both born and made. As in most debates over culture and nature, we need to look at both aspects of the process.

Certain characteristics, traits, and talents for leadership are natural to some people, much like musical ability is to some. For example, if you look at your family or your community, you can see that there are females (and males) who exhibit certain traits of leadership, who just organize their group or stand out in another way, sometimes even when they are only four or five years old. We should not deny that there are certain skills and characteristics that are particularly useful to leading that certain people have, much like some people are good at singing and some are not. It would be a disaster if you said everybody could sing equally well and you tried to make me a singer. You would be in big trouble. Similarly, I don't believe every-

body can be a leader. But there is also no reason everybody should be a leader. Part of the problem is that society has tended to mystify leadership skills as somehow belonging only to a few people who are then seen as better than everybody else. But if we view leadership skills as something that many people have to varying degrees — skills that can be built upon, supported, and enhanced because they are needed in the world, not in order to make one person superior — then we might have a better way of dealing with leadership.

There are natural leaders everywhere, in every ethnic/racial group, class, family, neighborhood, workplace, etc. — both female and male. But multiple factors affect what people can do with their leadership potential and whether, or how, it gets developed. It is in this sense that leaders are made — some are supported and given many opportunities to develop their leadership abilities and others are limited, discouraged, or even killed for asserting leadership. In some places today, as in the past with witches, some women get killed for taking leadership, as do some men. Sex, race, and class and the intersection of these, as well as other factors of location and timing, play a big role in how one's leadership evolves, whether it is recognized and supported or thwarted. In the U.S., for example, one is often allowed to be a “special interest” leader of one's particular identity group — be that on the basis of sex, race, religion, sexual orientation, or other factors. Yet, somehow only the dominant group (white male heterosexual Christians) is usually seen as “objective” or generic human beings who are therefore qualified to lead on behalf of the whole society.

Who gets support and who gets honored or killed for their leadership depends on a society's values, prejudices, hierarchies, and structures. If we want more democratic and inclusive leadership in our society, we must look at whether and how various leaders are recognized and supported, and seek to make changes in those structures and values. Women's leadership development programs can address this. We don't make women into leaders, but we can provide opportunities to enhance and support women's leadership and to make it more visible and viable. We can work to change the climate

of the society toward greater acceptance of women's leadership so that women leaders are taken more seriously and have more opportunities to be heard and to exercise power.

Why Should We Care?

Why should we care if women leaders get more recognition and power in society? What difference will it make? If you care about what is going on in the world around you, locally and globally, you should care about women's leadership as a potential source of change. The world needs women to take more leadership. Women at this moment in history bring new perspectives and values to the table that can revitalize and transform debates and options in a globe that is threatened with self-destruction based on past — predominantly male — leadership. Quite frankly, it is hard to imagine that women could do worse. So we might as well give it a try. This is not a biological but a historical argument based on women's different experiences from men's for many centuries and their general exclusion from power. At least at this moment in time, women's leadership offers opportunities for change.

Women are positioned in an important way to bring different experiences to the table that could lead to different options for our globe. While none of this is inevitable or necessarily biological, there do seem to be tendencies for women to create more cooperative modes of leadership. Again, looking at ethnic conflict, whether in the Middle East, Rwanda, Somalia, or the former Yugoslavia, it is primarily women who have crossed the ethnic lines and have tried to create conversations that would break through some of those intractable conflicts. This is not all women, nor is it no men; but it is mostly women's leadership that is making the way for peace and working to create new possibilities in places where conflict is great.

Women's leadership may also address the need for a more integrated and holistic approach to the social issues of our day. Women's experiences generally bring the public and the private together more than do men's, and women usually have had to work in a way that sees how things are interconnected. This is something

that our over-fragmented, specialized world needs. Of course, I also hope that women who have been excluded from power will have more sensitivity to the task of working for the inclusion of everyone. But this is not inevitable. Margaret Thatcher wasn't good at it and some other women leaders haven't been. But overall, there is a pattern to suggest that women have a more inclusive view of the need for bringing everyone into the process. The male domination model of one person or group needing to feel superior to another is part of the crisis of domination based on differences that we face in the world today. We can hope that women will adopt less dominating, more collective and cooperative models of leadership. Such models tend to bring more people into the process on a more equal footing, and thus get more ideas on the table and give more people a stake in the solutions devised.

Finally, you should care about women's leadership because representation is a fundamental matter of democracy and justice. Even if having more women in recognized leadership at all levels of society did not make a difference in policy, we can't claim to have democracy in this country and most of the world when the representation of people in power is so skewed toward men. This is a question of sex, as well as of race, class, and other factors. If we believe in democracy, the full diversity of the population affected should have more voice. This is increasingly recognized internationally by countries that are experimenting with a whole range of ways to create quota systems in different parts of the electoral process, from Scandinavia to Argentina to India to East Timor to France. The United States is behind in recognizing that democracy is simply not realized if much of the population is excluded from the process of decisionmaking.

Women's Global Leadership

The Center for Women's Global Leadership has spent the last decade working to enhance women's leadership and to bring more women's voices onto the global agenda, particularly around human rights. When we look at the changes that women have

achieved in the public arena, we see that there is now somewhat wider acceptance of women as leaders on the so-called “soft” issues. In the United Nations for example, women are heads of the agencies dealing with population, refugees, children, and now even human rights. But women are not seen as leaders on most of the “hard core” issues like disarmament and national security, or of financial institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. I want to see women as heads of these agencies in order to challenge them to be different; and part of challenging them is breaking through the notion that these positions involve too much power for women to handle. This is one of the tasks ahead for women to move further into the “hard” areas like finance, trade, defense, and disarmament.

We also need to address the question of changing the climate for women to lead. What would it really mean to create a climate in which we assume that women's leadership is a natural, normal phenomenon at all levels of society? This has happened a couple of times in Scandinavian countries, which have had even more women than men in their cabinets. We know that for women's leadership to be different and to make a policy difference, it has to be more than just isolated individuals who get power. Political studies show that when women are a critical mass (usually defined as 25 to 30 percent), then the climate changes such that women can make a bigger difference and not have to be just like “one of the boys” to survive.

This is a time of opportunity for more women's leadership, an opportunity that comes in many ways with the crises of our times that are creating a new context in which women can lead. The end of the cold war and the expansion of globalization both have challenged many of the old systems and created the need for new thinking and new ways of acting. Similarly, intensive civil conflicts and wars in the past decade that have been fought on civilian territory have involved women in peace making and brought calls for new approaches to these crises, which has led to growing attention to women in peace making. This issue even reached the U.N. Security Council in October 2000. But these opportunities have to be taken up and agendas transformed for women to have the kind of power

not just to respond to crises, but to change the conditions that lead to them. Our challenge is to take women's leadership to the next level. Women must do more than just clean up the messes male leaders have made in the world and challenge their policies; we must come up with alternative proposals and ways of operating that might lead the world to a different place. The stakes are great and this seems reason enough to care about the potential of women's leadership, locally and globally.

SUSAN CARROLL

is a professor of political science at Rutgers University and a senior scholar at the Center for American Women and Politics at Rutgers' Eagleton Institute of Politics.



I am going to examine the questions “Power for what?” and “Why should we care about women’s leadership?” from the perspective of politics and political leadership, focusing specifically on women who hold public office. In responding to these questions, I want to make three points. First, I want to argue that most women who serve in public office believe that they have a special responsibility to represent women and their interests. Second, I want to argue that the actions of women public officials suggest that many women are different from men as political leaders precisely because they do take seriously this responsibility to represent women. And third, I want to suggest that those of us who want women public officials to continue to represent our needs and interests should support these women in a politically pragmatic manner; we need to ask what we can of them, but we also need to be sensitive to the constraints they face as political leaders.

In making these points, I am going to draw on research conducted by Rutgers’ Center for American Women and Politics at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, especially interviews we did between 1995 and 1998 with about three-fourths of the women who served in the 103rd and 104th Congresses.

First, most of the women who serve in Congress and the state legislatures, regardless of their party, political ideology, or race and ethnicity, feel a special obligation to represent the interests of women within the institutions in which they serve. In some cases the women bring this commitment into office with them. One such example is Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC), who, of course, had a long history of advocacy on behalf of women before she was elected to Congress. She noted in our interview with her:

[B]y the time I got to Congress, my view on women and my feeling of responsibility for pressing forward their demands was very well formed.... This was just another place, another forum, to act on them. (August 24, 1995)

Similarly, Representative Cynthia McKinney (D-GA) noted: I am an African-American woman who has a certain set of life experiences that differentiate me from the typical male member of Congress. Therefore, I bring that to the institution, and the institution is changed and enhanced because of the difference I bring. (October 29, 1997)

Some women, however, do not run for office with the intent of representing women and women's interests. Rather, they become advocates for women as a result of serving in these offices and their advocacy is a response to the neglect of women's interests that they see within the political institutions in which they serve. For example, Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI) recalled:

When I first came to Congress in 1965, I had a notion that my basic responsibility was to my constituents and my state. And gradually as I took my place here, I realized that I had a far greater role to play and that it extended far beyond just caring for the constituents' needs — that I had to speak for all the women in America. (October 19, 1995)

Similarly, Congresswoman Marge Roukema (R-NJ) insisted in our interview with her that she initially hadn't wanted to take on women's and family issues, and she described her evolution as an advocate for women's interests as follows:

When I first came to Congress.... I really didn't want to be stereotyped as the woman legislator.... I wanted to deal with... things like banking and finance. But I learned very quickly that if the women like me in Congress were not going to attend to some of these family concerns, whether it was jobs or children or equity.... then they weren't going to be attended to. So I quickly shed those biases that I had, and said, "Well, nobody else is going to do it; I'm going to do it." (July 20, 1995)

But elected women officials do more than just express a desire to represent women's interests within the political institutions in which they serve. They translate this commitment into action, and

the end result is that they are different kinds of leaders than men. Their presence in office does make a difference, especially on public policy, and I want to offer just a couple of examples to illustrate some of the ways in which the presence of women in public office makes a difference.

The first example is about the leadership of women members of Congress in the area of women's health care. Almost every week we hear about the findings of some new medical research study conducted with funding from the U.S. government, specifically from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH is a major source of funding for medical research and for many years all the medical research that was funded by NIH — research on things like heart disease and cancer — was conducted on only men. In fact, until recently, incredible as this may sound, even the breast cancer studies sponsored by NIH were based largely on research on men!

In recent years National Institutes of Health has changed its policy, and current government-funded research studies are based on clinical trials with women as well as with men. But what led the NIH to change their longstanding policy of including only men as subjects in medical research?

The answer is relatively straightforward: the efforts and commitment of women members of Congress. Back in the mid-1980s, Congresswoman Pat Schroeder (D-CO) was reading the results of several NIH-funded studies when she noticed that these studies kept referring to “men.” She assumed that they must be using “men” generically to refer to both “women” and “men,” but just in case, she and Olympia Snowe (R-ME), who were at the time cochairs of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, asked for a profile of participants in the health care studies. When they received the profile, they discovered that only men were included in those studies. Congresswomen Schroeder and Snowe, who were quite upset about this, then enlisted the help of Congresswoman Connie Morella (R-MD) and Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), who represented the district and state, respectively, where the National Institutes of Health are located. Schroeder, Morella, and Mikulski asked to meet

with representatives of NIH who eventually agreed to change their regulations to mandate the inclusion of women in future studies. The women members of Congress, assuming they had won the battle, then went back to work on other issues.

A couple of years later, however, the congresswomen noticed that various press stories on medical research funded by NIH were still referring only to men, so they requested another profile on participants in these newer studies. They discovered that NIH had changed its regulations to say that women must be included as participants in clinical trials, but had chosen not to enforce the regulations. Pat Schroeder, who served in Congress for more than two decades, wrote a book on her experiences in the U.S. House of Representatives with a very clever title, *24 Years of House Work... and the Place Is Still a Mess*. In this book she claims that at this time NIH “was in such total fear of females that even the lab rats were male” (1998, p.78).

When the congresswomen found out that NIH wasn't even enforcing its own regulations about including women, they convened the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues and drafted a package of legislation known as the Women's Health Equity Act. Among other things, the act mandated the inclusion of women as subjects in medical studies, the establishment of an office of women's health at NIH to review every study before it received funding, and appropriations for gender-related diseases such as breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and osteoporosis. It took years of work to get much of the legislation passed, but as a result of the efforts of Pat Schroeder, Olympia Snowe, and their colleagues in the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues who were just doggedly persistent, there is much more research and attention to women's health concerns today than 10 or 15 years ago.

However, it is not just on clearly gendered issues, such as women's health, that having women in public office makes a difference. Women public officials also often make a difference and act as agents of change on issues that are not explicitly or obviously gendered. Regardless of whether the issue is foreign aid, the budget, or

the environment, women public officials frequently examine the issue through a gendered lens, and consequently more often think about the possible impact of the policy on the lives of women and children.

The example I will use to illustrate this point is a story told by a well-known New Jersey political woman, Hazel Gluck. Gluck is a Republican who has held several elected and appointed positions in New Jersey, but the story concerns her work as commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Transportation during the administration of Governor Tom Kean. It illustrates that even in an area such as mass transit policy, women's presence at the decision-making table makes a difference.

As we all know too well, traffic congestion is a major problem here in New Jersey. In order to ease traffic congestion, the Department of Transportation under Gluck's administration tried to encourage more people to use public transportation through expanding the state's park-and-ride system, so that people could leave their cars in a lot for the day while they took a train or bus to work. Gluck, writing while she was still commissioner of transportation, described differences in the way men and women decision-makers approached this public policy problem:

The men working on the system are looking at opportunities for new sites, expanding old sites, and determining how many cars can be accommodated. The women working on the system are promoting more than just a place to park a car and hop a bus or train. They're thinking along the lines of logistics and eliminating unnecessary errands faced daily by working men and women — e.g., Could we have a dry cleaners, a convenience store and/or a gas station located in the same park-and-ride facility? Then you could get off your train, pick up the groceries you need, gas up your car and head for home — not only saving time and effort, but also easing traffic. (“The Difference,” *Journal of State Government*, p.225)

Because their life experiences and responsibilities still differ in some significant ways from those of most men despite the many changes we have seen in gender roles, women are likely to examine

and evaluate public policy proposals through a different set of lenses than the lenses that men use. In this example, because women more often bear the responsibility for laundry, grocery shopping, and meal preparation, they were, not surprisingly, the ones who came up with the idea of locating a dry cleaners and a convenience store in the park-and-ride lot. This example, however, demonstrates more than the fact that women more often than men think about how policies will affect women's lives. It also demonstrates — and I think that this is the truly crucial point — that the process of thinking about how policies may affect women's lives can lead to better and more effective solutions to whatever public policy problem is at hand, in this case traffic congestion.

I have admittedly painted with very broad strokes here. Although most women public officials perceive a responsibility to represent women in the public policy process, the manner in which they fulfill this perceived responsibility is, of course, affected by their personal ideologies, by their political party, by their race and ethnicity, and perhaps most importantly by the political composition of the districts or jurisdictions they represent. Some women public officials are so personally conservative, or represent such ultra-conservative districts, that they are almost never going to side with those of us who have feminist predispositions (although I could tell you about a couple of instances where they have). However, the vast majority of women public officials, Republicans and Democrats, are potential allies for feminists on many issues. They feel a commitment to represent women, including women who do not necessarily look like them, and they often follow through on that commitment.

Of course, women public officials are going to be more likely to act on the responsibility they feel to represent women if they believe someone out there is watching, someone who cares about their actions and is appreciative. That's where those of us who may never run for office ourselves — although I hope many of you do — come into the picture. We need to let women public officials know that we are counting on them and that their efforts are appreciated.

The leadership of public officials, to be sure, is constrained leadership. Women serving in elected offices have to be re-elected every few years or they will lose the positional power that they have. All elected officials will tell you that their first and foremost responsibility is to represent their constituents, and it better be so, or they won't be in office very long! There are times, though, when the need to represent the constituency that elected a woman public official comes into conflict with her own views on a public policy issue or with what you or I might want her to do. For example, there was a woman named Jolene Unsoeld (D-WA) who served in Congress from 1988 to 1994 and was generally a great champion of feminist causes. But Unsoeld always was on the opposite side of most feminists whenever an issue related to gun control came up for a vote. The reason? Her constituents were adamantly against gun control. So we have to be pragmatic in our support and recognize that elected women may not always be able to be with us on every single issue. Nevertheless, we must be willing to work with them when we can.

In conclusion, let me go back to the questions I posed at the beginning of my remarks that are the two central questions for this panel: "Power for what?" and "Why should we care about women's leadership?" — in this case, women's leadership in the political arena. Because many of the women involved in politics are using power and exercising leadership to help bring about a system of government and public policy making that is more responsive to, and reflective of, the needs and interests of all its citizens. We are a long way from reaching that goal, but the political leadership provided by women and other traditionally underrepresented groups is moving us closer.

**DEBORAH GRAY
WHITE** is a professor and chair of the Department of History, Rutgers University.



History is full of ironies, one of which is the nature of the transformation of black women's leadership in the twentieth century. In the early part of the century, middle-class black women were trained to be leaders or "race women." In fact one didn't choose a career with the idea of self-satisfaction in mind. One chose a career — as nurse, teacher, or social worker — with the idea of being a leader of the race, which also meant being a representative of the race. Today, black women lead in every aspect of American life and self-satisfaction is a major reward of that leadership. Ironically, however, it's not all progress. Although there are probably more black women leaders now than ever before, it is also true that black women have fewer leaders than ever before.

This is not difficult to understand. The turn of the century was a time in African-American history known as the nadir, a time of severe repression. Lynching prevailed. Disenfranchisement, segregation, and unmitigated violence against black people were the order of the day. An African American could not contemplate personal advancement without thinking about how it would affect the race, how one would contribute to racial advancement, or how one would improve the lives of the masses of black people. Black girls who could afford an education were literally trained to work for the race. The clubs of the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), a federated organization of women's groups founded in 1896, made it their business to organize girls clubs that would teach girls their responsibility to the race. Spelman College, the first black woman's institution of higher learning, and the numerous other single-sex and coeducational schools also made this their principal goal. So too did the first black women's sororities, Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta. As Janie

Porter Barrett, a young co-ed at Hampton Institute discovered, “race training” could be tiringly intense. Drilled every day on her duties to her race, she confessed to her diary in 1881 that she looked forward to Sundays because “on Sundays, I didn’t have to do a single thing for my race.”¹

This had both a down and an up side. As Barrett’s comment suggests, it did not take a twenty-first century, western sensibility to find such training an imposition on one’s privacy and individuality. But ironically, a very positive sense of self could result from the immersion in racial self-sacrifice. At a time when most white women were encouraged to choose between a career and home-making, young black women were encouraged to be leaders and to defend black women’s right to lead. For example, Anna Cooper, a founder of the NACW and an educator, writer, and school founder, declared that it was up to women to mold “the strength, the wit, the statesmanship, the morality, all the psychic force, the social and economic intercourse” of the era. Said Cooper, it was the “colored women’s office to stamp weal or woe on the history of her people.”² Addie Hunton, another club leader, and mover in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, boasted that “the Negro woman has been the motive power in whatever has been accomplished by the race.”³ While Fannie Williams, a Chicago-based club leader, claimed that “the Negro is learning that the things that our women are doing come first in the lessons of citizenship,” Josephine Silone Yates, an early president of the NACW, insisted that this national black women’s organization was for black people “the first step in nation-making.”⁴

Black female leaders also defended black womanhood. They wanted the world to know that all the allegations impugning the black women’s character were false, that black women had gone for hundreds of years able to “cry for protection to no living man,” and yet, through the travail of slavery they had “maintained the ideals of womanhood.” They celebrated black mothers for their “painful, patient, and silent toil...” and their heroic struggles “against fearful and overwhelming odds that often ended in death.”⁵ Rather than

being ashamed of their history, they offered it to young black women as a source of pride.

Young black women clearly needed this kind of pride and encouragement. Theirs was a double burden. They had to fight both racism and sexism. They organized separately because white women in the suffrage and birth control movements were racist and kept black women out of their organizations. Similarly, although some black men gave encouragement to black women many felt threatened. Black men vigorously kept women out of leadership positions in the black church and fought against women's leadership at every turn in secular organizations. Beset on every side, black women did what made sense. They formed and led their own organizations, spoke from platforms of their own creation, and bit their tongues for no one.⁶

In contrast to yesteryear, things have changed. For sure, black women still face racism and sexism. But because black women's leadership takes place in a different context than it did at the turn of the century, black women's organizations are not on the front lines of the battle against discrimination. Gone is the overt repression that molded black people and black women into a united community. Gone with it is the urgent incentive to indoctrinate young black women with a sense of duty to the race and its women. Of course, systemic discrimination persists; but it is not as open, nor as violent, nor as obvious as it was at the turn of the century. It was the blatentness and completeness of discrimination that forced black women to organize and lead with such strength and determination. In the absence of the congealing force of violence, black women's organizations have weakened and have lost their vitality.

This is obviously mixed news. It is good that black people do not live with the fear they did earlier in the century, and that black women's work and career options are broader. Besides not being limited to nurse, teacher, or social worker, black women can choose work that does not translate into race leadership. A turn of the century black woman did not even have the option to be a sales clerk; and if by chance she had been so blessed, she would automatically

have become a leader by virtue of being the “representative” of her race, an example of what others could do if they put their minds to it. Today, black women choose careers and do things that have nothing to do with either their race or their gender. They can choose to be an astronaut like Mae Jemison or a congresswoman like Corrine Brown, Julia Carson, Eva Clayton, or Sheila Jackson Lee. Today, they can strive to be like Ruth Simmons, president of Brown University, or like Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor to the president of the United States. Today, black women can choose not to be “representative” black women. They don't have to be self-sacrificing for their people. They can choose a career with self-satisfaction in mind. They can express their individuality in a way they could not do earlier in the century.

Yet for all that has been gained, something has been lost. No other women in this country, and no other minority women, have the history that black women have in fighting both racism and sexism at the same time. Black women have been more persistently in the forefront of these struggles than any other American women. Look at the lives of Sojourner Truth, Mary McLeod Bethune, Ella Baker, Pauli Murray, Fannie Lou Hamer, Aileen Hernandez, Johnnie Tillmon, and Shirley Chisholm. It is good that the times allow black women to lead in walks of life other than the fight against racism and sexism. But this is also a time marked by government policies that hurt black women. The recent welfare legislation is a case in point. In the last 50 years, the number of single black female-headed households has grown astronomically. Black women raise more black children alone than any other group of women. They have the worst health care in the nation, suffering disproportionately from diseases like AIDS, diabetes, heart failure, breast cancer, and hypertension. Black women need leaders to deal with black women's issues on a national level, and yet with the dispersal of black women's leadership that has come with the opening of American society, there is less focused attention on these issues than ever before.

Similarly, black women need their defenders. The last decade of the twentieth century found black women attacked on every side.

Anita Hill was ridiculed when she charged Judge Clarence Thomas with sexual harassment; Johnetta Cole was lambasted as a left-wing sympathizer when her name was mentioned as a possible candidate for Secretary of Education under former President Clinton; Lani Guinier was publicly slandered for her opinions on voting and congressional districting; and Jocelyn Elders was summarily dismissed when she advocated masturbation as a way to cut down on teen pregnancy. American history has shown that black women have had few defenders as steadfast as themselves; and yet when Mike Tyson was celebrated upon his release from jail for raping a black female teen, there were no black women's organizations to raise a cry of protest. Gone is the repression of yesteryear, but gone too are the Anna J. Coopers, the Fannie Williams', the Addie Huntons — all those women who defended black women and who trained young women to do likewise. And we do need them, because for all the progress, racism and sexism have not disappeared.

Hence the irony. We have today more black women leaders than ever before. They are in all walks of life and they represent all kinds of people. While we celebrate this progress, let us remember that although there are more black women leaders than in yesteryear, black women still have fewer leaders than ever before.

1 Quoted in Stephanie J. Shaw, *What a Woman Ought To Be and To Do: Black Professional Women Workers During the Jim Crow Era* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), p.69. This entire book details the kind of race training young black girls received.

2 Anna J. Cooper, *A Voice From the South: By a Black Woman of the South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988 [1892]), pp.143, 145.

3 Addie Hunton, "Negro Womanhood Defended," *Voice 1* (7):280 (1904).

- 4 Fannie Barrier Williams, "The Club Movement Among Colored Women," in *The Voice of the Negro*, 1 (3): 102 (1904); Josephine Silone Yates, "Woman's Clubs" in Du Bois, ed., *Efforts for Social Betterment*, p.47. Yates was NACW president from 1901–1906.
- 5 Bert James Lowenberg and Ruth Bogin, eds., *Black Women in the Nineteenth Century, Their Words, Their Thoughts, Their Feelings* (University Park, PA.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976), pp.274–275, 329.
- 6 On this subject see Deborah Gray White, *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894–1994* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999).

HELEN CALDICOTT
is an Australian
pediatrician and
founder of the
Nobel prize-winning
Physicians for Social
Responsibility, an
organization com-
mitted to educating
the public about the
dangers of nuclear
power and weapons.



I am speaking as a physician, deeply concerned about the fate of the earth. The earth is dying. When you have a patient who is dying, unless you discover the cause of the disease, you cannot cure the patient.

So why is the earth dying? There is one obvious reason, and this is apparent from all of these wonderful talks today — the men are in control. We've also heard today that women make a difference. However the magic number is 30 percent. Below 30 percent representation, women behave to please the men. But in an organization where the female representation is 30 percent or above, women start voting for milk for children instead of for bombs.

I would submit that we are biologically different. Let me give some examples. If a man has cirrhosis of the liver because he is an alcoholic, he can't metabolize his estrogen. Consequently his hair falls out and he develops very soft skin. His testicles atrophy and he becomes soft emotionally. If you give a woman testosterone, as we used to do for breast cancer, the woman becomes emotionally aggressive, she develops more body hair, and her voice deepens. In fact, there are genetic diseases manifested in girls who cannot metabolize cortisone. Their hormonal path becomes diverted and the cortisone precursors are converted to testosterone. These women typically are excellent at sport — in the past, before adequate testing was performed, they were often Olympic champions. But if this metabolic deficit is remedied by treating them with the missing cortisone, they lose their muscular power and they stop winning their races. I had a couple of sisters in my general practice who were athletes. After the appropriate diagnosis and treatment they became visibly upset as their testosterone levels declined and they stopped winning their school races.

Essentially therefore, males and females are biologically different. We are prisoners of our hormones which can, at times, induce severe PMT, and also postnatal depression. (This particular syndrome is induced when the woman loses the placenta which is a potent supplier of estrogen and progesterone throughout the pregnancy.) The sudden drop in hormonal levels often leads to depression for several days *post partum*, but it can occasionally persist and lead to postnatal psychosis.

I was one of the speakers at the National Women's Conference in 1977 in Houston, and I finished my speech by saying that women are the nurturers. Margaret Mead followed me. She climbed onto the stage, five feet tall with a staff and a cloak, and said "Yes, women are the nurturers." She added that in prehistoric times, women used to stay in the caves feeding the babies, caring for the men, and cooking the food, while the men went out and killed the saber tooth tigers and the mammoth elephants to protect us women. In those days testosterone was appropriate and necessary for biological survival.

Times have changed, but men are still in control. I am not being sexist as I say this. I am a physician trying to make a diagnosis of why we are killing the earth. Let me elucidate the planetary symptoms:

1. Global warming is definitely happening.
2. Ozone depletion is very severe. The sun is so toxic in Australia that if you are exposed for five minutes you develop sunburn.
3. Toxic pollution is very serious. There are 80,000 chemicals in common use. Bill Moyers, who was recently tested as part of a televised program on environmental pollution, was found to have 84 of these toxic substances in his body. Many of the substances were carcinogenic, including dioxin and PCBs. We all have been exposed to similar substances.
4. Trees and forests are being decimated all over the earth. Trees reverse global warming but we "harvest" them for their timber. It's good for business!

5. Species extinction is rampant. A hundred species a day are becoming extinct. There are thought to be 30 million species on the planet and within 50 years half of these could be rendered extinct. The Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA) will enhance access of multinational corporations to the Amazon, and this amazing natural wonder will probably be destroyed within a few years.

6. Over-population of *homo sapiens* is another major global problem. If women are educated and their standard of living is increased, the birth rate naturally declines.

Apart from these generic problems, we now have George Bush in power as president of the United States. This is a condition which as a physician I consider to be very serious.

To give some background, I spent one and a quarter hours with former President Reagan in a private dialogue about the nuclear weapons situation in 1983, and while I clinically assessed his IQ to be low, from my current reading I consider that of George Bush to be even lower; and he is also clearly dyslexic. That is not meant to be an insult to those people who suffer from dyslexia; but it is inappropriate for the president of America to be dyslexic because at a time of heightened international tension, or an error induced by a computer malfunction, the president has only three minutes to decide whether or not to press the button and launch the massive nuclear arsenal of the United States. There is now a telephone hotline that connects the White House with the Kremlin. If Bush speaks to Putin during this emergency, and he makes a mistake in his language or syntax, he could be misinterpreted and by mistake blow up the world. Language is terribly important.

Bush is also severely disadvantaged as president because he seems to know virtually nothing about the rest of the world. His appointees add fuel to the level of anxiety. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was described by Henry Kissinger as the most ruthless man he has ever known. Rumsfeld is a major proponent of Star Wars. In order to justify this massively dangerous weapons buildup, Rumsfeld is setting China up as the new cold war enemy. One of his chief

advisors is Richard Perle, nicknamed the Prince of Darkness by his colleagues in the Pentagon during the Reagan years. It was Perle who was primarily responsible for Reagan's massive nuclear weapons build up.

The corporate-controlled Bush administration, for its part, has thus far been deleterious to planetary survival. It has ignored the Kyoto Protocol to impede global warming and is reversing many of the environmental regulations that have taken decades to negotiate.

I am very exercised about these new dangers to planetary survival. I have three grandchildren. The earth is dying. In 50 years it is going to be even warmer and the increased use of air conditioners by their very operation will continue to aggravate global warming and ozone depletion. The driving of cars will almost certainly become restricted or even illegal as they add to global warming. (SUVs, which get 12 to 15 miles per gallon, should be banned.)

What is the solution? Female passion. When I led the nuclear freeze movement in the 1980s, I could feel the heat of the bombs. I dreamt about them at night. I could see people being vaporized. I could see that woman in Hiroshima running, holding a baby, being converted into a charcoal statue. I've stood beside children dying of leukemia, their bellies swollen and their heads with no hair. And I've watched them die, knowing their parents would never, ever recover. I have delivered many babies — the miracle of a perfect new human being slithering out of this fat belly. I am driven to maintain this perfection of nature.

Women hold up 53 percent of the sky and it is inappropriate that we allow the men to run the world and to potentially destroy our children's future. All political policies are fundamentally about women's issues. We are 53 percent of the population, we do two-thirds of the world's work for which we earn one third of the income, we own one percent of the property, and we have all the babies. Thus far we have not taken appropriate responsibility in the parliaments and the congresses of the world. Often when I give a speech, everyone will surround me, and I'll say to a man, "You should run for

Congress.” And he’ll say, “Yeah.” Then I’ll say to a woman, “You should run for Congress,” and she will step back and say, “Who me?” That is a conditioned reflex. Many of the black women in the early part of the century would have stepped right into their power, as we have heard today, and probably still would.

So we are pathetic — we are pathetic. I have never given a talk like this before. But I have developed more confidence in my opinions having worked only with women over the last three months and having been surrounded by women.

I was going to talk about my leadership and how I got to be a leader. Well, I got to be a leader because at the age of 12, I decided to do medicine. When I was 15, I read *On the Beach* by Neville Shute. I never trusted an adult again. Being naturally curious, I read everything I could find about nuclear weapons. I couldn’t understand why people kept building and blowing up ever more bombs. Then I entered medical school at the age of 17 and in first year biology I learned about radiation genetics and fall-out and how it induces random compulsory genetic engineering and cancer. I’ve just been there ever since. My soul was branded when I was 15, like a hot iron branding a cow. Maybe I’ve got mad cow disease! So I just turned into a leader because I cared. That is how you get to be a leader. And nothing stops me. Nothing. I go in to see President Reagan or anyone else I need to see.

I have nothing else to say. Except that it’s been lovely to be here. Thank you Mary, and everyone, for the privilege of being here and working with women. It has been a formative experience and I guess it has changed for me the way I conceive the world, changed my frame of reference — even though I was there initially, I am very much more there. I think women hold the key to the future. If we don’t move, the world is dead and my grandchildren will not live out their normal life span.

I believe that if we allow the Bush team to proceed to develop a new cold war and Star Wars, these policies will cause vertical proliferation as America builds more nuclear weapons; lateral proliferation will eventuate as the rest of the world looks on and says, “We’ll

do it too.” Even little Australia has been trying to develop nuclear weapons. I predict that if nothing changes, within 20 years, 20 more countries will have nuclear weapons, and within 20 years there will definitely be a nuclear war. Nuclear war means the end of life on earth. Nuclear winter can be induced by only 1,000 bombs exploding more than 100 cities. America has 5,500 bombs on nuclear hair-trigger alert at this very moment.

We were almost annihilated in 1995 when Yeltsin came within seconds of pressing his nuclear button and launching 3,000 nuclear weapons heading towards the United States.

This impending global crisis that I have described is urgent. I don't think we've ever faced a situation on the earth in the three million years that we've stood on our hind legs and used the opposing thumb that we've faced such danger as we do now. We actually hold creation in the palm of our hands. We are about to destroy it.

The only solution that I can see, the only solution that has never been tried, is that women take over.

BIOGRAPHIES

MARY K. TRIGG is program director of the Institute for Women's Leadership where she heads the Leadership Scholars Certificate Program. She is also associate director for the Center for Women and Work, Rutgers' School of Management and Labor Relations. She holds a Ph.D in American civilization from Brown University. Her areas of expertise include American women's history, women's education and leadership development, women and activism, and women and work. She is currently engaged in a research project on work, family, and community in the lives of professional women.

Dr. Trigg taught in Rutgers' Women's Studies Program from 1989–1994. She directed a research project on sexual harassment in New Jersey schools and an oral history project on the first co-educational class to graduate from Rutgers College. She has been a National Historical Publications and Records Commission Fellow in historical documentary editing and has been awarded an AAUW Education Foundation Grant and a Woodrow Wilson Research Grant in women's studies. Her publications include articles in the *Journal of Women's History*; *Initiatives*; *Transformations*; and *American National Biography* among others.

MARY S. HARTMAN is university professor and director of the Institute for Women's Leadership at Douglass College, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. A historian specializing in women's history and gender studies, Dr. Hartman has a B.A. from Swarthmore College and an M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia University. She has authored and edited numerous books and publications, including *Talking Leadership: Conversations with Powerful Women* (Rutgers, 1999); *Re-Imagining the Past: A Subversive View of Western History* (forthcoming); *Victorian Murderesses: A True History of Thirteen Respectable French and English Women Accused of Unspeakable Crimes* (Schocken, 1977); and *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women* (Harper and Row, 1974).

Dr. Hartman served as the dean of Douglass, the college for women at Rutgers, from 1982 to 1994. In that role, she initiated a number of nationally recognized programs for women, including the Douglass Project for Rutgers Women in Math, Science, and Engineering; the Center for Women's Global Leadership; the Laurie New Jersey Chair in Women's Studies; and the Institute for Women's Leadership (IWL). Since assuming the directorship of the IWL in 1995, Mary Hartman has coordinated planning and support activities for the consortium. She teaches an annual seminar on women's leadership with colleagues in the IWL-sponsored leadership curriculum for undergraduates.

CHARLOTTE A. BUNCH, named Distinguished Service Professor by Rutgers' Board of Governors in 2002, is in the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at Rutgers and has served since 1989 as executive director of the Center for Women's Global Leadership. Dr. Bunch has been both an activist and a practitioner in the women's and civil rights movements for over three decades. Prior to her work at the global center, Bunch was founding director of the Public Resource Center, a tenured fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, and a founder of *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly*. She has written numerous articles, edited seven anthologies, authored one collection of her work titled *Passionate Politics: Feminist Theory in Action* (St. Martin's, 1987), and coauthored *Demanding Accountability: The Global Campaign and Vienna Tribunal for Women's Human Rights* (UNIFEM, 1994).

Internationally renowned for her work in human rights, Dr. Bunch was inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame in 1996. In 1999, she was selected by President Clinton as a recipient of the Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Human Rights. In 2000, she received a "Women Who Make a Difference Award" from the National Council for Research on Women. She currently serves on the boards of the Ms. Foundation for Women and of Human Rights Watch's Women's Rights Division.

SUSAN J. CARROLL is a professor of political science at Rutgers and a senior scholar at the Center for American Women and Politics at Rutgers' Eagleton Institute of Politics. She earned her B.A. from Miami University (Ohio) and her M.A. and Ph.D. from Indiana University. Dr. Carroll has conducted research on women candidates, voters, elected officials, and political appointees. She is also a highly respected media commentator on these subjects.

Dr. Carroll's work focuses on the status and impact of women within the political system. A recipient of numerous major research grants, she most recently codirected a research project titled "The Impact of Women in State Legislatures: The View from 2001." Dr. Carroll is also the author of various works on women's political participation including *Women as Candidates in American Politics* (Indiana, 1985); *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions* (ed., Oxford, forthcoming); and *The Impact of Women in Public Office* (ed., Indiana, 2001).

DEBORAH GRAY WHITE, who is currently professor and chair of the Rutgers' Department of History, received a B.A. from SUNY Binghamton, an M.A. from Columbia University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Dr. White also served as a research professor for Rutgers' Institute for Research on Women from 1999 to 2000. From 1997 to 1999 she was the codirector of the very successful project "Black Atlantic: Race, Nation, and Gender" sponsored by Rutgers' Center for Historical Analysis.

Professor White's first book *Ar'n't I a Woman?: Female Slaves in the Antebellum South* (Norton, 1985), received the Letitia Brown Memorial Book Prize. Her second major monograph, *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894-1994* (Norton, 1999), takes a century-long look at the motivating factors behind black women's organizing. She is also the author of *Let My People Go: African Americans 1804-1860* (Oxford, 1996) and coauthor of *Our United States* (Silver Burdett Ginn, 1997). Her current research project looks at the numerous recent mass marches — the Million Man

and Women Marches, the Million Mom March, and the Promise Keepers — as a way of assessing American race, class, and gender relations at the turn of the twenty-first century.

HELEN CALDICOTT, an Australian pediatrician who taught at the Harvard Medical School in the 1970s, is a passionate advocate of citizen action against the nuclear and environmental crises. Founder of the Nobel prize-winning Physicians for Social Responsibility, an organization committed to educating about the dangers of nuclear power and weapons, Dr. Caldicott is also the founder of Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament (WAND). In addition, she founded the Cystic Fibrosis Clinic at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the "Our Common Future" political party in Australia. She is currently establishing a new organization for public education called the Institute for Common Sense in the Nuclear Age which is to be based in California.

Dr. Caldicott has received numerous awards, including 19 honorary degrees. She is the author of *Nuclear Madness: What You Can Do* (Norton, 1979); *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War* (Bantam, 1985); *If You Love This Planet: A Plan to Heal the Earth* (Norton, 1992); and *A Desperate Passion: An Autobiography* (Norton, 1997). Her latest book is titled *The New Nuclear Danger: George W. Bush's Military-Industrial Complex* (New Press, 2002).

Designed by Karen Jackson
Photography by Nick Romanenko

**INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP
CONSORTIUM MEMBERS**

Douglass College

Department of Women's and Gender Studies

Center for American Women and Politics,
Eagleton Institute of Politics

Center for Women's Global Leadership

Center for Women and Work, School of Management
and Labor Relations

Institute for Research on Women