Women in the Sanctuary Movement
by Mary Sullivan

On January 16, '85, Peggy Hutchison and fifteen other sanctuary workers were indicted by the U.S. government on charges of conspiring to violate immigration laws by providing sanctuary to refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala. The lengthy trial which followed gained national attention, particularly when it was revealed that the Justice Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service had sent paid informants into church congregations to tape services. The celebrity status of a few sanctuary workers continues to grow, as does public outrage over "spies in the pews." The stories of the refugees, however, remain for the most part untold.

Peggy Hutchison addressed this invisibility of the refugees, as well as the lack of media attention to the women volunteers of the sanctuary movement, in her lecture last November at the YWCA in Columbus. Her presentation, "Women in the Sanctuary Movement," was part of the Ruth Shuman McLean Lectureship Series. Today Hutchison, who became involved in the sanctuary movement while she was director of Border Ministry for the Tuscon Metropolitan Ministry, is a convicted felon. Her five year sentence was suspended; however, she is still not permitted to vote, or travel with refugees across the border. She often has her phone cut off on long distance calls, or hears other voices on the line; in addition, she must file paperwork with her probation officers before she is permitted to travel. For Peggy, however, these "inconveniences" pale in comparison to the stories of rape, torture, and mutilation which refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador tell her and hundreds of other
sanctuary workers. Her work with refugees, the trial, and her status as a convicted felon all have proven to be radicalizing experiences. As she put it, "Before the trial, I knew there was a lack of justice for the poor, and people of color. I knew it intellectually. After the trial, I knew it experientially; I am more sensitive to those issues now."

The sanctuary movement began, quite simply, as a response to human suffering; the first church to officially declare itself as a place of sanctuary for Central American refugees was the Southside Presbyterian Church in Tuscon, Arizona in 1982. Currently, over 300 churches and synagogues across the United States are involved in this movement. Most of those in sanctuary work would define themselves as religious, acting from their faith rather than from political motivations. The political ramifications of such actions, however, must be addressed. Historical precedents for religious acts of civil disobedience, such as the underground railroad during the Civil War era, are frequently mentioned by sanctuary activists. Also pointed to is the United States' history of selective immigration enforcement, evident in the 1940's when Jews attempting to flee Europe were met with borders tightened by strict immigration legislation.

This same type of discriminatory immigration policy, contend the sanctuary workers, is evident in the Reagan administration's failure to grant asylum to Central American refugees. Both international law and the laws of the United States stipulate protection for those fleeing persecution. For example, the Geneva Convention of 1949 was enacted in response to the Holocaust, in order to protect refugees fleeing oppression. The Refugee Act of 1980 states that asylum is to be granted to those who have "a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." Despite the fact that since 1980 more than 50,000 civilians have been killed in El Salvador (and at least 80% of this figure represents deaths inflicted by their own government), the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) refuses to grant asylum to Central American refugees. Instead, the INS interprets the reason for immigration in these cases as "purely economic;" one former Under-Secretary of State for Human Rights remarked that Central American refugees had come "looking for a welfare card and a cadillac."

The bias of the INS is evident upon examination of the number of requests for asylum granted to other refugees. For example, the INS grants 41% of all requests for asylum, but less than 3% of requests from Salvadoreans and Guatemalans are granted. In 1984, more than 13,000 requests for asylum were filed by Salvadoreans; only 328 were granted by the INS. (In contrast, approximately 78% of Soviet requests are granted.) Often the Central American refugees are required to provide documentation of their persecution, which for many of those fleeing for their lives is not only impossible, but also absurd. Since 1980, more than 35,000 Salvadoreans and Guatemalans have been expelled from the United States; according to Amnesty International, at least 1 of every 50 refugees deported to El Salvador is executed (and this is probably a very low estimate).

None of this evidence, however, was deemed permissible in the trial of Hutchison and the other sanctuary workers in Arizona. The religious motives of the workers, as well as U.S. and international law, conditions in Central America, refugees' accounts of torture and death squads, and the bias of the INS in granting asylum, were all dismissed in court as
"irrelevant." For Hutchison, the trial was reduced to a tragic comedy. "We were unable to talk about law," she said. "We were unable to talk about why the refugees had fled. People tortured; people who had family members killed. We were unable to use INS statistics. We were unable to talk about state of mind, and I kept thinking, if we had been indicted for murder, we could have at least been able to use state of mind as a defense... But none of this was to reach the ears of the jury." Instead, the case focused on whether or not a conspiracy to harbor illegal aliens had occurred; Hutchison and seven others were found guilty.

Unfortunately, the legal and moral issues surrounding the sanctuary movement were not addressed during the trial. In response to such issues, Hutchison remarks, "Are we really violating the law? We do not believe that we are. But, in fact, we are violating the executive will of the government of the United States, an executive will that ignores the decision of the world court... Let us be clear about those distinctions: the executive will and the law of this land."

Women who are sanctuary workers, and female refugees and their children, have been largely invisible in the media coverage of the sanctuary movement. One is tempted to draw a comparison between this invisibility and the fact that stories about the sanctuary movement have been relegated to the "religion" section of most newspapers and magazines, hidden away in the back. Indeed, if any such coverage is provided, it usually focuses on the male clerics of the sanctuary movement. Conditions in Central America which are contributing to this wave of refugees, as well as the involvement of the United States in perpetuating such conditions, are seldom addressed either. But what about the women who are helping the refugees in their journey to safety? And what about the women and children themselves; how much do any of us know about their lives in El Salvador and Guatemala?

The sanctuary movement is sustained largely by the efforts of female volunteers, who meet refugees and journey with them across the border, and who organize everything from letter writing campaigns to locating shelter for the refugees. Peggy Hutchison provides several explanations for the large number of female volunteers. "It is women who are taking the risks," she said, "many of whom are lay women. Women are those who know what it means to lose children. We are more in touch with those feelings... [It is also] women who have had years of oppression, and so we are more sensitive to issues of oppression."

Hutchison has found it necessary to sensitize the press regarding women's role in the sanctuary movement. She believes that it is important for women to be speaking about and interpreting the issues of the movement. Moreover, she is deeply concerned about the lack of attention given to the experiences of the refugees themselves. She has been forced to realize that "instead of torture [of the refugees] being the hook, it is the spying in churches which has captured attention. It is an unfortunate reality, but we will have to take advantage of it." One effective strategy Hutchison has employed in her lectures has been a central focus on brief life histories of the women she has met through her involvement with the sanctuary movement. In so doing, she has rendered the conditions of their lives, as well as the complicity of the United States, more visible.

One such woman Hutchison speaks of is Maria:

Maria is a woman that I will always remember. I met her in a safe house in Mexico. She had about six children and a couple of grandchildren. She was a very strong woman. Now why Maria could be strong after the kind of life experience she had, I don't know. Maybe we connected, Maria and I, not because I am a mother yet, but because she was a laywoman for the Catholic Church in El Salvador; I am a lay woman in the Methodist Church. Maybe we connected because she believed that you are supposed to put the Bible into
action. I don't know. But it was Maria and her family who, after they learned that they were seen as subversive because of their work with the Church, moved, uprooted from town to town. They didn't flee, even though they knew they were running the risk of death, because that was their mission. That is what they were called to do.

And so it was that one day the military caught up with them. How ironic that it was on Good Friday that they came to Maria's home and they took her husband, screaming, away. They began to rape Maria, time after time, lighting off a grenade outside the home so that there would be no noise. The children were in the next room, knowing what was happening, the violation of their mother. But it was Maria who, after those military men left, took her children and continued with the ministry.

But what about her husband? He had been one of those desaparecidos, the disappearing ones. She would go out looking, day after day. Her courage and her strength persisted day after day. She looked in those normal places: garbage dumps, ravines, along the side of the road. . . I wonder how many plastic bags of dismembered bodies she looked at, time and time again, trying to recognize her partner in life. And one day, a campesino came running in from the fields and said, "Maria! Maria, I have found Jose! I have found him — Please come!" And Maria came. Do you know what she said to me? She said, 'Peggy, do you know that I could not even bury my husband because he was in so many pieces. He was in so many different pieces... My God, I could not even bury my husband!"

What did she do? She gathered her children, this strong, gentle, courageous woman, and they began the journey northward. Not to hide, but so that she could tell her story to me and my brothers and sisters and friends in this country. When I first saw her and the children, I noticed that the children had weird marks, on their faces especially, and also on their hands. And I, of course, thought, "well, they must be malnourished; they have been traveling over 2,000 miles and they really haven't been able to eat well. That must be what it is." Then Maria began to tell me about the napalm bombs that were being dropped in El Salvador. I said, "Oh well, come on, our country did that in Vietnam, Maria, but in El Salvador? We haven't been reading about that in the newspaper." I found out later two things: the report in the Christian Science Monitor over six months later that in fact, yes, napalm was being dropped on the people of El Salvador. I also found out later that those marks on the children's bodies were burns from napalm, diagnosed by a doctor in Los Angeles, California.

Ultimately, Peggy Hutchison turns to the courage and persistence of the refugees for her inspiration and strength. "There is nothing criminal about sanctuary," she declares, "and there is certainly nothing heroic, or sberoic, about sanctuary ministry. It is an act of compassion, of humanity. . . What has happened to those women in North America, and men, who have been involved in the sanctuary movement? You see, it hasn't been a burden. In fact, our lives have been enriched by this connection. The refugees - men, women, and children - have taught us so much about wholeness, about life in its entirety — Perhaps they have taught us that our risks are really nothing in comparison to what is happening to them in their homelands."

It is another refugee named Maria, also from El Salvador, who taught Hutchison the meaning of hope in the presence of overwhelming oppression. Maria's story is one which "ties everything together" for Peggy.

One day 58-year-old Maria was in shopping at the supermarket, and the treasury police came for her. They took
her away, they bound her up, gagged and blindfolded her, put her from car to car and drove around until they finally reached their destination, only for eight days to repeatedly rape her and torture her, day after day. She told me about how swollen her fingers and her toes were. I remember her pulling her dress up and showing me her knees and her breasts. I didn't want to see it - the torture marks around her neck. She went into explicit detail of those eight days. She even told me about a young man who was supposed to stay and guard her, and as the other comandantes left, he went to her and gave her a cup of water. She said that her throat was so dry and parched and bleeding, she didn't know if she should drink it or not. And he said to her, "Mujer! Woman! If you get out of this alive, run! Flee! Leave, because they will come for you again, and you won't make it out again!"

And so it was at some point after those eight days that they piled her in a car, took her and dumped her, and left her on the side of the road abandoned. How is it that a woman who was tied at her hands, her wrists and her feet, blindfolded and gagged, after being beaten and violated for day after day, could somehow want to live? Somehow she was able to get to the side of the road and find a rock and a stick to get free a little bit, and she was able to convince a taxi driver to stop at twilight. Disoriented, mixed up, she saw a smokestack in the distance and knew that was her home. So she asked the taxi driver to take her. He got to her home, and when he realized who she was, he said, "Mujer! Woman, had I known who you were, I wouldn't have done this! I could lose my life for this! Get out, quick!" And he sped off.

Somehow she got to the door, but she could not knock. She said, "I was so swollen and in pain that I could not even lift my arms up." People from inside the house opened the shutters, and then they closed them, because, you see, they thought the death squads had come again, the treasury police or the military. But somehow she convinced them - her persistence, her patience, her strength, and her courage - until they opened the door, saw who it was, and brought her in. She was smuggled into a hospital.

At some point in time, however, I got so I couldn't hear any more; I said, "Maria, enough! I don't want to hear any more! I can't stand it!" I began to cry. Then it was Maria who ministered to me, who responded to me, who comforted me. This gentle and strong woman, it was Maria who did that. When I was calmed down and had stopped crying, she said, "Now Peggy, I want to tell you the rest of the story." And so it was that she told me of her journey, being smuggled out of the country and smuggled north. I met her in that safe house in Mexico. We crossed the border together. After that, Maria went to Texas, because she wanted to tell her story, but she developed mental and emotional problems. I heard that she was unable to continue, and I was sad. I continued to wonder what had happened to her.

It wasn't until four years later, after the verdict and I was asked to Los Angeles, that I walked into the room and I saw a woman. She grabbed me; she looked familiar; she said, "Peggy!" I answered, "Maria?" And she said "Yes - I am here, I am here in Los Angeles, and I am still telling my story. I have written some poetry, and here it is. That is what I continue to share with the people of your country, in the hope that someday, someday, we can go back home."

I said to Maria, "Maria, I remember very well something that you said to me
when you were telling me your story years and years ago. And it has carried me through some difficult times." Because, when Maria had told me that violation of a human life, I said, "Why? Why do you continue to believe? Why do you even care anymore? Why do you believe in a God of justice? I mean, how can you have hope?" And she said, "Peggy, I am not free until all of our people are free. And you're not free until all of our people are free... We have a saying in El Salvador. That saying is this: the last part of a person that dies is his or her hope."

The waves of refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala continue, as does the work of Peggy Hutchison and hundreds of other sanctuary workers. It is time, says Hutchison, for every individual to face some very difficult questions, questions which each refugee brings on his or her journey to North America. The sanctuary movement ultimately forces each of us to examine not only the manner in which the policies of the United States affect Central America, but also whether we choose to respond to the human suffering in our midst.

Mary Sullivan is a student in sociology and women's studies at OSU.

The Center for Peace at St. Stephen's: A Short History
by Madeleine Glynn Trichel

Five years ago this month, the Vestry of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church made a somewhat unusual decision. The proposal was to institute and house a year-long program of peace education and to hire a full-time director. Since the church could not really afford such a program, the director's job was to include fund-raising.

This was not an easy decision for a single congregation, especially one located on the campus of The Ohio State University. Everyone remembered the controversies of the Vietnam War era. Yet, after discussion, the Vestry decided that the need for peacemaking education had become an even more crucial matter than it had been twenty years ago.

The goals were modest enough and quite specific, as if specificity would protect the venture from the controversy usually surrounding the word "peace." The objectives were:

1. to promote greater understanding of the world's peoples, religions, and cultures.
2. to discuss the dimensions of United States defense and foreign aid policies;

3. to pinpoint the everyday issues of peace faced on a personal and local level;

4. to encourage peace education in the lives of children and within families;

5. to explore alternative responses to aggression, including the concept of the "just war."

With these goals, and plans for programs to pursue them, the Center for Peace opened for its year of business with little public attention, and people wondering whether it could accomplish any of its goals.

Every once in awhile, though, dreams do come true. The dreams of the people who proposed the Center for Peace, of the Vestry which approved it, and of the congregation which has sheltered it have been coming true for five years now. The Center has struggled through the usual problems of small, experimental programs: running out of money, volunteers, and space; running into growing pains as some of the programs took hold and succeeded beyond expectation. The Center succeeded beyond expectation simply by continuing for five years instead of the one originally planned.

These years have included an unusual variety of peacemaking education: a one-day conference on Jerusalem, which brought together Muslims, Jews, and Christians; "Folkways," a five-week program celebrating local ethnic groups; numerous programs on the Soviet Union for audiences ranging from four year olds through senior citizens; several publications; a film competition; and small conferences. The list amounts to about 15 pages, typed, single-spaced!

One achievement is the Barrie Strauss Peace Library, dedicated on Veteran's Day, 1985. This small lending library is used by a variety of people: church women looking for prayers; an OSU student looking for materials on the environment and the arms race; students from Oberlin working with elementary schools; a student from Worthington writing a term paper on economic effects of the arms race in the Third World; public school teachers looking for materials on the Holocaust.

The big surprise, the dream which succeeded beyond our wildest imagination, has been the Summer Peace School. It began in 1982 as an experiment to "fill up" the slow time in the summer. Now it is a major project which has touched many hundreds throughout Ohio and even in other states. That first summer 45 children came every morning for a week to learn about peacemaking at home, school, play, and in the larger world as well. The staff of the school, all volunteers except the Director, decided immediately that one week was not long enough. So next summer, the same group of adults taught a two week Peace School.

By this time, people were asking "What is Peace School?" "Can it be done in other places?" "How?" In answer, some of the women who had been involved since the first summer began to figure out just what we had done, what made it different and effective, and what others needed to know to get their own schools underway. After our first -- tentative -- workshops, two or three of us began to travel to other communities to teach adults how to teach peacemaking. As a result, during the summer of 1986, there were at least twelve Summer Peace Schools. Some of these programs were small, involving only 20 children or so; others reached as many as 200.

In the meantime, the original Peace School has continued. It now functions as a lab school, where we try out new materials and methods and provide training for adults. Two books are in progress: one, a manual for teaching peacemaking; the other, a picture book which illustrates our project.

We are having a birthday party to celebrate our past and look to our future. What of our new dreams? We will dream of expanding our program on the USSR. We will hope for greater impact on the university and city. We will continue teaching peacemaking
in the summers and working in the other seasons to support the growing network of
peace teachers. And - always - we will dream of Peace.

Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict: A Look Through
a New Lens
by Melinda Kanner

Recently I had the opportunity to deliver a paper at the Modern Language Association
Convention in a session called "Mothering Theory and Lesbian Literature." My
contribution to this session examined the nature of the real-life relationship between the
anthropologists Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead. The vast body of available literature
which compares theirs to a mother-daughter relationship hardly could be discussed as
"lesbian literature;" however, the real-life but distant and documented example provides
considerable evidence for exploring the recent array of mothering theory literature (for
conclusive, bound by the sociocultural context in which Benedict and Mead lived, somewhat
confounded by the secrecy in which they conducted their relationship, this paper offers
brief examination of the reproduction of a mother-daughter relationship in one rather
famous real-life case.

Neither Margaret Mead nor Ruth Benedict ever authored lesbian literature; neither was
ever the topic of specifically lesbian literature. In fact, neither ever concerned herself
professionally with lesbianism. Both, however, devoted considerable professional energy to
anthropological discussions of mothers and mothering in many societies. Until the
publication in 1984 of Mead's daughter's memory of her mother and father, With a
Daughter's Eye, only those directly involved in their deception knew that the private lives of
these very public women had been concealed, protected, and disguised. Margaret Mead and
Ruth Benedict were, from the time of Mead's graduation from Barnard until Benedict's
death in 1948, lovers. The nature of their relationship, obscure from their families,
friends, and colleagues, was cloaked, both naturally and artificially, in the disguise of a
mother-daughter bond.

The idea for this exploration into the underlying dynamic of the Mead-Benedict
relationship emerged from an analysis of several biographies of Mead and Benedict
(Mead 1959, 1972, 1974; Modell 1983; Bateson 1984; Howard 1984) in an effort to uncover patterns
in Mead's relationships with the two people with whom she had the most intimate and
enduring relationships — Ruth Benedict and Gregory Bateson, her third husband and the
father of her only child. Overwhelmingly Mead's relationships, both casual and intimate,
were characterized by her domination of others. The respect, adoration, and obedience
she commanded are legend. Less widely known, however, was the extent of her
dominance in her relationship with Benedict.

The conjunction between Mead's personal dominance and the complexity of the
Mead-Benedict relationship is the focus of this discussion. I will consider this conjunction in
terms of three dimensions. First, the independent and shared desire of Margaret
Mead and Ruth Benedict to be mothers, an end which Mead but not Benedict
accomplished. A second important consideration is the relationships between
Margaret Mead and her mother, Emily Fogg Mead, and Ruth Benedict and her mother,
Beatrice Fulton. Central to this issue is the intense and consistently articulated
ambivalence toward being mothered that both Mead and Benedict felt. An attempt will be
made to discover in what ways and to what extents the patterns of interaction between
these biological mother-daughter dyads were subsequently played out in the relationship between Mead and Benedict. Finally, the nature of their relationship and the elaborate process of its concealment will be explored. Mead and Benedict selected and agreed upon the construct of a mother-daughter bond for the public presentation of their intimacy. This choice, in the face of numerous other possibilities, such as mentor-protégé, or simply colleagues, is in itself extremely revealing of both women's feelings about their roles as mothers and daughters.

Mead and Benedict were both extremely prolific writers (see Modell 1983 and Howard 1984). Both wrote widely on a range of anthropological topics, including culture and personality and sex role socialization. Both were regular and passionate writers of poetry. Both have been the subject of numerous biographies, including two biographies of Benedict by Mead and Mead's 1972 autobiography. In addition, Mead wrote for both scholarly and popular audiences, and for many years was a columnist and advice-dispenser in Redbook magazine, the pages of which she filled with observations and advice on child-rearing, family conflict resolution, and the distance which separates generations of parents and children. Motivated not only by anthropological concerns, Mead, by self-appointment and often by general consensus, functioned as a mater familias to the world. She offered as fact that which she knew and observed through the informed and trained eye of the anthropologist, but, at the same time, that which was filtered through the lens of unique personal experience and attitudes. An understanding of Mead personally greatly enriches, and often confuses, our understanding of her role in American culture, in American anthropology, and our understanding of the formation of one segment of American attitudes and beliefs about motherhood and mothering.

Ruth Benedict, the less famous of this couple, separated from the public eye by her death nearly forty years ago, provides the starting point. Ruth Benedict, fourteen years Mead's senior, was 33 when Margaret Mead first enrolled in an anthropology class for which Benedict was a teaching assistant. Mead, originally a psychology major, switched to anthropology as she fell sway to Benedict's passionate devotion to the discipline. Benedict was shy, quiet, and hesitant; her seriousness of purpose won Mead's own devotion. Benedict's biographer, Judith Modell, describes the initial attraction:

Ruth saw in Margaret Mead a woman starting out on 'the adventure' and apparently determined to 'chart her own course.' Margaret, also, gratifyingly, asked to be taught, advised, and socialized into the discipline. Her unabashed enthusiasm bolstered Ruth's confidence. (Modell 1983:144)

The professional and the personal were constantly merged, their mutual enthusiasm and increasing interest in both began to flourish in the early years of constant contact. The lines of the relationship were, at first, clearly drawn. Benedict longed for children of her own; finally she converted her desire to bear children into the "perfect friendship" which provided the structure in which she could function as a mother. Through her extensive diaries and journals, we have a fairly detailed picture of her early years, and her retrospective view of her experiences, fears, hopes, and relationships during her formative years. Her father died before she was two years old, leaving her mother alone, exhausted from nursing him, and with a three month old infant in addition to Ruth to care for. Moving to her parents' house for financial and emotional support, Beatrice Fulton turned her attentions entirely to the care of her daughters raised in this multi-generational household.

In Mead's 1959 biography of Benedict, she cites passages from Benedict's incomplete autobiography. In describing her mother's grief for many years following the death of her father, Benedict writes that she never loved her mother; instead she describes her reaction with an oddly explicit sexual image:

My mother was crushed by my father's death. She was left with two babies, one three months old, and she wanted desperately to have me remember my father. She took me into the room
where he lay in his coffin, and in an hysteria of weeping implored me to remember. Nothing is left to me consciously of this experience, but if it is suppressed it would go a long way to explain the effect my mother's weeping always had upon me. She made a cult of grief out of my father's death, and every March she wept in church and in bed at night. It always had the same effect on me, an excruciating misery with physical trembling of a peculiar involuntary kind which culminated periodically in a rigidity like an orgasm. It was not an expression of love for my mother, though I often pitied her. (Mead 1959:98)

Ruth received a complex double message from her mother during her childhood: on the one hand, she saw her mother's unrestrained outpouring of emotion. On the other hand, Beatrice Fulton instructed and enforced control, manners, and self-discipline in Ruth and her younger sister, Margery. Moreover, Benedict suspected something of an exaggeration in her mother's expression of love and grief, for, while she was momentarily at a loss and profoundly saddened, Beatrice snapped back with self-determination and resourcefulness from the loss of her husband.

The paradigm of power gained and lost, domination, yielding, control, and the relinquishing of one's will had become well-established in Benedict's relationship with her mother. As a child Ruth began to have emotional outbursts – tantrums – at regular intervals. Ruth's histrionics were not only controlled by a predictable dramatic context which acted as a safety valve, allowing her to maintain a detached, aloof exterior, but they were matched by an equal condemnation and prohibition by her mother.

Subjugated by her mother's control, confused by her mother's emotionalism and inconsistency, Ruth discovered a world over which she could have dominion and control: she began to write, to invent, to create characters and universes for them to inhabit.

Benedict entered Vassar, following the tradition established by her mother. She continued to develop her writing, majoring in English and, for the first time in her life, received encouragement and praise for her achievements. After graduation Benedict travelled throughout Europe and the United States. At age 24, she arrived in Pasadena, California in worse emotional straits than ever, deep in the conflict between repression and her desire for passion.

Surrounded by women, Ruth found it impossible to turn to them for support and a perspective on her own difficulties. While she portrayed private dilemmas within the fictional lives of women, she shied away from real women who might guide her through the puzzles in her own life story. (Modell 1983:75)

Much of Benedict's writing is concerned with her perception of the dichotomy between male and female, both in human societies and in herself. She sought to understand the sources of creativity in women, particularly in women writers. In her self-analysis, she was convinced and resigned herself to the belief that vitality, creativity, and the energy necessary for ambition lay in the hands of males alone. As a woman she believed herself confronted with the choice of no choice. Naturally lacking the vitality she believed the exclusive property of males, she saw her fate as a woman compromised.

She began to focus on having children as a possible source of fulfillment.

Perhaps my trouble comes from thinking of the end as my present self, not as a possible and very different future self. It is hard never to fall into the way of thinking that now you are ready to use your hard-won experience – it is always very hard for me to feel that year after year is just preparation – and for what? The great instinctive answer is for Motherhood – yes, I think I could accept that with heart and soul – so much do our instincts help us out in our problems – but no girl dares count on Motherhood. Ethically, if Motherhood is worth while, it ought to be also worthy to have a hand in the growth of a child or woman. The difference is just a question of instinct. (Mead 1959:122)

Benedict's identification with her father is traced to her earliest recollections of him,
those which chiefly surround his death and its aftermath. Benedict saw in the loss of her father a loss of part of herself. She became preoccupied with thoughts of death, a theme which dominated much of her early writing. She questioned the "supposeds" of marriage and conventional love, and constantly explored the contrast between male and female, and the presence of both in her own nature. During the period of 1914 to 1919, through her verse and journal entries, it is clear that Benedict became increasingly sure of her lack of fit in the roles available to her as a woman and ever drawn to the maleness she found within herself. This period, as it happened, coincided with her marriage in July of 1914 to Stanley Benedict.

In a marriage unhappy from its start, Ruth focused all her attention on her dreams of having children. Although she and Stanley rarely enjoyed intimacy, she made intense, if sporadic, efforts to revive their lifeless relationship. As he closed himself off, she infused their talks of children with the hope of personal and collective salvation.

Unfulfilled in wifehood, thwarted in her dreams of motherhood, discouraged and underestimated by her husband, and self-doubting, Benedict turned to anthropology with the same passion she had taken to her marriage, her dreams of children, and her writing. In 1919 she enrolled at the New School for Social Research, and her graduate career in anthropology was launched. Moving to Columbia and the leadership of Franz Boas, Benedict met a passionate, enthusiastic undergraduate, Margaret Mead, in 1922. In Stanley Benedict, Ruth had found a potential lover turned friend. In Mead, she found a student turned friend turned lover. The two shared a love of anthropology, poetry, and passion itself. Herein enters Margaret Mead's story.

Mead, born on December 16, 1901, was a first child, "wanted and loved" (Mead 1972:19). Her mother, Emily Fogg Mead, approached the prospect of motherhood systematically, scientifically, and compulsively.

Before my birth, my mother kept a little notebook in which she jotted down, among other things, quotations from William James about developing a child's senses, as well as the titles of articles on which she was working for various encyclopedias, and here she wrote, 'When I knew the baby was coming I was anxious to do the best for it.' (Mead 1972:19)

Like Benedict, Mead grew up in a household with several generations; being a granddaughter became almost as important as being a daughter, and Mead's relationship with her paternal grandmother provided for her much of the affection and emotional and physical demonstration which were lacking in her relationship with her mother. Her grandmother's influence extended from technical instruction on such topics as woodworking, weaving, and zoology to individual creativity, to lessons on femininity. Mead came from a family of teachers on both parents' sides; every day was an experience in new lessons to be learned, new skills to be mastered.

Mead's mother was serious, straight-forward, principled, and practical. She had no feeling for fun or play, and rarely engaged in any childhood recreation with Mead and her sisters and brothers. No interest in comfort, no leaning toward the sensuous, she avoided indulging herself and never indulged others. Her assets, according to Mead, numbered two: she was generous and she was trustworthy. She failed to provide the Mead children with affection, warmth or conventional motherly attention.

Mead suffered profound deprivation in her relationship with her mother. Unlike Benedict, with her retreat into fantasy and hysteria, Mead compensated for these deprivations in three critical ways: First, as a young child she turned to her maternal grandmother for the affection and tenderness she craved. Somewhat later, she became a sort of mother figure to her younger siblings. Finally, she sought renown, it has been suggested, to compensate for the lack of recognition and approval she suffered in early life.
When Mead was four years old, another baby girl was born to her parents. Mead was allowed to name this child and, to the extent she was able, took over the care and management of her siblings. Katherine, the baby, died at nine months; it was a loss which deeply shook each member of the family differently. Two more sisters followed. At this stage, Mead’s relationships began to assume the shape they would for her entire life.

I learned to make these notes with love, carrying on what Mother had begun. I knew that she had filled thirteen notebooks on me and only four on Richard; now I was taking over for the younger children. In many ways I thought of the babies as my children whom I could observe and teach and cultivate. I also wanted to give them everything I had missed. (Mead 1972:64-65)

Mead’s often successful attempt to control and manipulate the lives of those around her began early in life. She felt protective, even maternal, toward her mother when she was herself a child. She assumed the roles of caretaker, educator, and nurturer for her sisters and brother. Where Benedict worked out her frustrations in her own writing, Mead played hers out on a real stage with the lives and personalities of her family.

Mead’s plans for marriage and family never posed a threat to disrupt her education. Her plan was clear and, at age seventeen, she took steps to ensure her success. She became engaged to a young man, Luther Cressman, who was a divinity student. After college, she would marry Cressman, begin having babies, and, as a minister’s wife, have control over a well-defined community. During her early college years, she determined that she and her friends were enjoying inadequate exposure to children; she set up a baby-sitting service to remedy this lack. Spared from the vagaries of dating and courtship by virtue of her early engagement, Mead acted as house-mother and chaperone for her apartment mates. Mead, according to her roommates and fiance, desperately craved and required attention and approval. One of her methods for achieving this end involved her three rules for getting along with people: (1) Be useful to them; (2) Be amusing for them; and (3) Build them up in their own estimation (Howard 1984:44). It seems that Mead possessed a special gift for the third rule. Mead demanded a great deal from all who surrounded her; in return she nurtured, frequently controlled, always managed and manipulated.

When Mead met Benedict in 1922, she was experiencing an awakening on many fronts. She had discovered anthropology, she had fallen under the captivating influences of Ruth Benedict and Franz Boas, and she was beginning to become fully aware of her own powers. Like Benedict, Mead was constantly a daughter as well as a mother. In the early stages of their relationship, Mead played the role of the daughter. She was the daughter Benedict never had, and brought to her life joy, energy, and a positive affirmation of life (Howard 1984:57). Worried by the fourteen year separation in their ages, Mead feared that Benedict would lose interest in her. Benedict felt that Mead was a comfort to her: a student to be molded, guided, and shaped in her plan.

As Mead began to achieve greater recognition outside of their tightly enclosed relationship, the lines of power and domination began to shift, gradually at first, then dramatically. The roles of mother and daughter had become fully reversed by the time of Benedict’s death. Increasingly Mead assumed control in their relationship. By 1939, the distribution of power and control had fully shifted. An incident reported by Howard reveals the extent of Mead’s growing tyranny. Benedict had agreed to assist a close friend in a divorce case by offering to testify in court if necessary. The soon-to-be divorced wife learned of the arrangement, contacted Margaret Mead, and threatened to expose Ruth Benedict publically as a lesbian if she supported the husband seeking divorce. Mead wrote to Benedict, furious that Benedict had dared to take such a risk.

What this story helps to show ... is how Mead’s power was expanding. Her letter to Ruth Benedict could reduce that esteemed and distinguished mentor, fifteen years her senior, to despair.
now the balance had permanently shifted. Once Mead had relied on Benedict for guidance; now it was the other way around. Now it was Mead, in this and all her other relationships, who called the shots, or at least she tried to. (Howard 1984:214)

Later Mead observed: "Ruth and my husbands and other adults all had an incorrigible tendency to see me as a mother, because I treat adults the same way my grandmother treated my parents" (Howard 1984:260).

Benedict died at age 61 of a coronary thrombosis. Mead, by all reports, grieved openly and wept fiercely at the funeral, although she later denied being moved this profoundly. Philosophical about the deaths of those close to her, Mead makes an interesting, perhaps unconscious association of Benedict and her own mother:

"When people die I have no sense that I have lost them. I mean, it's too bad that they're not here.....I'd love to hear Ruth laugh again.....Sometimes I imagine writing her a letter about something happening now: how she would laugh at this, how Mother would feel about that..... (Howard 1984:281)

Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead grew up a generation apart in a society whose cultural forces dictated fairly rigid gender roles. Both were privileged with education, somewhat monied families, and considerable encouragement for their academic and professional pursuits. Benedict began early in her life to question the assumptions made by her culture for male and female characters and male and female roles in that society. Benedict sought to understand the male and female in her own nature; Mead vigorously denied the slightest hint that there existed a trace of maleness or masculinity in her personality. During a period in anthropology when theories about the relationship between child-rearing practices and adult personality began to emerge, Mead and Benedict provide splendid examples themselves of the very issues they demonstrated cross-culturally. Both were preoccupied with questions of origins and patterns; the lives of both were distinctly marked by patterns and origins of which were traced by them to their early experiences. Interestingly neither Benedict nor Mead ever wrote specifically about their relationship outside of their poems and sketchy journal entries. Mead's two biographies of Benedict, both very different in form and nature, provide the essential summary of facts about their relationship. Her descriptions in Blackberry Winter, somewhat more elaborate, still skim the surface, presenting only those details already in evidence without any of the introspection and psychoanalytic analysis characteristic of her descriptions of other relationships.

Each in her own way, Benedict and Mead expressed unhappiness, even bitterness, over some lack in their mothers' treatment of them. Each expressed a strong, at times, some claim, an even obsessive desire to have children. To each other and to the public and private circles from whom they kept the nature of their relationship secret, they presented a facade of a mother-daughter bond. Ultimately, as the balance shifted in their relationship, we find that power and control are revealed as the defining characteristics of the mother-daughter relationship. To some extent each sought comfort for and triumph over the ancient deprivations of childhood by attempting to reconstruct, or reproduce, a mother-daughter relationship. Much more to the point, each played out the dramas they witnessed and participated in daily with their own mothers as they learned how women in their worlds treated, loved, hurt, controlled, and submitted to other women.
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Women's Studies News

Sister! Sister!
February 25

The Department of Black Studies, the Center for Women's Studies, the Center for Comparative Studies, and the Office of International Affairs are sponsoring Sister! Sister!, a masterpiece one woman show which documents women's struggles and celebrates women's joys. Vinie Burrows uses the raw materials of true experiences and the words of gifted writers from Germany, Ireland, Soweto, Italy, and the U.S. to create an insightful, powerful theatre experience for and about the sisterhood of women. Sister, Sister will be presented February 25 at 8:00pm. in the Stadium II Theatre, Drake Union. For more information, contact the Center for Women's Studies, 207 Dulles Hall, 292-1021.

The Politics of Black Motherhood
March 4

Dr. Patricia Hill Collins, Assistant Professor of Afro-American Studies at the University of Cincinnati, will lead a colloquium entitled "The Politics of Black Motherhood." This event is sponsored by the Center for Women's Studies, and the Women of Color Consortium. This program will be presented March 4, at 4:00 pm. in the Conference Theatre, Second Floor, Ohio Union. For additional information, please contact the Center for Women's Studies, 207 Dulles Hall, 292-1021.

Rape Prevention Projects Grant

The Ohio Department of Health Women's Health Program has awarded a grant to evaluate the impact of rape education and prevention strategies designed for university students. The principal investigators of the study entitled, "The Impact of Rape Education on College Students," are Mary Margaret Fonow, Research Associate at the Center for
Women's Studies, and Laurel Richardson, Professor of Sociology.

The goal of the research is to assist service providers and educators with information about the effectiveness of their approaches to rape education and prevention. A standardized evaluation instrument will be developed for distribution throughout the state.

Activities of Women's Studies Faculty and Staff

The Sojourner is pleased to announce some of the current activities of its faculty and staff members.


Judith Mayne, Associate Professor, Center for Women's Studies and the Department of Romance Languages and Literature presented the paper, "Revisions, Retellings and Feminist Film Theory," at the Modern Language Association Convention held in New York City, December 27-30, 1986.

Sloan Seale, Graduate Teaching Associate for the Center for Women's Studies, presented "The Myth of the West, 1960's Style" at the Florida State University's Conference on Literature and Film.

Research on Women – Study Group

An informal study group is being established which would meet approximately once each month to discuss a research project which focuses on women. The group would provide an opportunity for scholars to present and receive feedback on research in its earlier stages; to discover possibilities for collaborative research; and to keep informed about the extensive research on women being undertaken by scholars at Ohio State. For more information, please contact the Center for Women's Studies, 207 Dulles Hall, 292-1021.

A Reflection On Sex Discrimination

by Cathy H.

Over four years ago I was a part-time philosophy instructor at a private university in Chicago. I lectured for three hours a week, usually on a Saturday or a Sunday, on the history of philosophy and on themes in existential literature. Prior to my stint as a lecturer, I completed a masters in Philosophy in two years after first earning a masters and a bachelors degree in English. While earning a masters degree in English, I taught courses in composition, rhetoric, and literature at a public, four-year state university. My teaching career, however, ended over four years ago with the inauguration of a new philosophy department chairman whose first official act was the replacement of all part-time female philosophy instructors with males.

Throughout graduate work in philosophy, I worked as a secretary and administrative assistant to the prior philosophy department chairman. I also completed the masters in English while working as the new philosophy department secretary. When contemplating
everything that happened to the department after my departure over four years ago, I interpret the new chairman's act as a personal favor. The new chairman resigned a few months later and is now teaching in the computer science department in our administration center. We regularly pass and greet each other in the hallways.

The study of philosophy intrigued me during my work in English because it was practiced at the university by a group of males who made claims and assertions that I knew were superficial, mere close readings of secondary texts. I listened to numerous discussions of Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, Scheler, Husserl, Aristotle - At this time, however, I had not read philosophy and could not articulate my knowledge through argumentation. What infuriated me the most and motivated me to complete a masters degree in record time, was the inference that references to literature or even to experience were insignificant and unimportant to the greater task at hand - scaling the heights of consciousness, self-consciousness, truth, Being - whatever the vernacular of the moment.

During my three years with philosophy I learned that male arrogance and hostility towards women is increased with each woman's attempt to participate in graduate student dialogues concerning philosophy, philosophers, philosophy professors, and fellow philosophy students. All of the comments I made, arguments and lines of reasoning I offered, both insightful and unclear, were interpreted as insignificant, especially considering the fact that I formed my ideas by applying past and present experience and extensive reading of fiction to the problem at hand. I knew very well that my extensive reading of literature and training in the close reading of literary texts intimidated males who had difficulty close reading anything original, and I took delight in referring to Eliot, James, Hawthorne, Melville, Wilde - when I sensed that I was not taken seriously. In response to the discrimination I experienced in discussions and from male faculty, I became arrogant and remain arrogant to date.

A far more negative result of the discrimination I experienced in a male philosophy program was the development of a new habit - not listening. As a means of surviving a required graduate teaching colloquium offered by the prior department chairman, my supervisor and benefactor (in return for doing much of his administrative work I was given a fellowship and part-time teaching), I learned how to turn on and off my listening ability at will. I honestly do not remember anything the chairman said during that class (other than his reflections on the American West, Buffalo Bill, and the lack of Jews as philosophers), only the context - graduate students sitting around a seminar table looking at each other with glazed eyes, sometimes registering shock, sometimes despair, but usually disbelief. The problem this habit presents me today is that I sometimes miss hearing the essential buried within another's rhetoric.

What I will always remember, however, and find helpful during difficult moments working in political, tense environments, are lessons the prior chairman taught me about power - how to get it, what to do with it, and what happens during the inevitable fall from power. As the department's secretary and administrative assistant for five years, I witnessed first hand the intricate maneuverings and delicate egos in action of men and women who had spent their lives in academics and felt entitled to both real and imaginary privileges. Direct, on-the-job exposure to power and its complexity taught me that the traditional philosophical distinctions between truth and falsity, appearance and reality take on meaning only within a professional or personal context. In the context of a philosophy graduate program, the sexist, demeaning attitudes of male academics towards female academics hurt less when looked at from the external, detached point of view of game playing and power politics.

In a positive sense, power gives a person or organization the means of accomplishing something worthwhile and meaningful. I had hoped that by studying philosophy and philosophers I would be able to counteract the
condescending attitudes of my male peers. My goal was to prove to them and to myself that philosophy was not limited to a privileged male elite, that I had the same talent, sensitivity, and commitment needed to withstand the difficulty of philosophy, particularly the never-ending uncertainty and continual sense of confusion and loss. I worked to change the minds of my male peers and professors and to an extent I believe I did. And my understanding of power leads me further to believe that I was successful to the extent that I worked for male and female faculty and with male and female graduate students.

All academics are indoctrinated with hierarchical thinking. Those who are lucky enough to secure tenure-track positions must move through a long sequence of compromises and 'selling out' to attain the carrot at the end of the stick. A lack of tenured teaching positions in the arts and sciences and a threat of those with tenure being given early retirement or being transferred to other departments altogether has created an environment of distrust, resentment, and full-scale competition for increasingly scarce resources. To survive the weeding-out process, a philosopher has to design innovative, unique strategies for positioning herself in an oversaturated market.

One positioning strategy for achieving power and success frequently used by women in predominantly male departments is to differentiate themselves as much as possible from clerical and secretarial staff. The woman faculty member is often uncomfortable with wielding authority over other women and overcompensates by refusing to establish a context of friendship and respect with support staff. The secretary is perceived not as a professional, but as an adversary to be used and then ignored or slighted. In reaction to the woman faculty member's negative perception, the secretary blames the faculty member rather than the problem itself which is created when a predominantly male department is forced to accept token females into its ranks. The same positioning strategy used by the woman faculty member is then used by the secretary to reconstruct her self-esteem after a negative encounter. Imagine the glee and smug satisfaction with which male faculty members and students retell the many difficult encounters they had witnessed between the secretary and the female faculty member.

Women in academics — whether in computer science and business, or philosophy and literature — must develop skills in marketing. Effective marketers who make use of the marketing concept do not first view their target market as one or two large groups possessing similar qualities and characteristics and then attempt to sell or promote their abilities and talents. Extensive effort is made first to differentiate segments within large groups, each exhibiting unique or distinctive needs or wants waiting to be fulfilled, and second to design a strategy for meeting these needs (in exchange for tenure, higher salary, job flexibility...). Within an academic environment, the marketing concept translates into a heightened sensitivity towards what the Other, the male department chairman or dean, is thinking for the purpose of anticipating his next moves. The same thinking process would, of course, be used with women department chairpersons, deans, or vice-presidents. We become ineffective and frustrated when we unimaginatively lump all men or all women into undifferentiated segments based upon demographics such as age, race, sex, or sexual orientation.

Although I would not recommend the path I took to arrive in my present world of university fund raising and public relations to everyone, I am glad that I had an opportunity to observe and participate in academics from virtually every perspective. In fact, my current work provides me with a positive means of revenge for past sexist, demeaning treatment on the part of male and female faculty members and students. All past claims to inherited or earned wealth made by faculty and graduate students in my presence have been duly reported to the proper fund-raising officials.

Cathy H. is currently a member of the Development Department at her university.
Announcements

Women’s History Week
In celebration of Women’s History Week, the Columbus YWCA is sponsoring a series of special programs. For information on any of these events, contact Linda Kanney, 224-9121.

Women’s History in the Making
March 7 9:30-5:00 pm
YWCA, 65 South Fourth Street
This conference, sponsored by several community organizations, is designed as a forum to inform women on the topics of employment and education laws. The two featured speakers are Mary Francis Berry, a member of the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, and currently professor of history and law at Howard University, and Carol Beier, staff attorney and Georgetown University fellow with the National Women’s Law Center. The conference will also include a panel on the status of employment, education, and training laws in Ohio, and an issue panel on developing equal access to employment and training for women. A wine and cheese reception at the end of the day will provide an informal means of exchanging information and ideas with local organizations. Registration for the conference is $10.00.

Brown-Bag Events
The following brown-bag programs will be held at noon at the Columbus YWCA free of charge. To order brown-bag lunches, call 221-0699.

March 9 “Lifting As We Climb”
Yesterday, Today: One Voice: Have the goals and aspirations of black women changed over the last 100 years? Ruth Gresham, Special Assistant at the Ohio State University's Office of Human Relations will offer some perspectives.

Women’s Calendar Update
“Recollections”: Edna Bryce, longtime Columbus resident and businesswoman, will offer several vignettes regarding her life as a black woman in Columbus since 1926.

March 10 “The Story of Working Women”
Susan Josephs, Associate Professor of the Ohio State University’s Labor Education Research Service
Anne Argo, Community Liaison, the Elizabeth Blackwell Center at Riverside
Susan Josephs and Anne Argo will present and comment on One Fine Day, an historical and inspirational film about women’s struggle for political and social gains.

March 11 “Whatever Happened to Nannerl Mozart and Fanny Mendelssohn?”
A multimedia presentation looks at these talented sisters of more famous brothers, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Felix Mendelssohn.

March 12 “The Women’s Movement: The Last Twenty Years”
Dr. Verta Taylor, Associate Professor of Sociology, OSU
Dr. Leila Rupp, Associate Professor of History, OSU

Women’s Tribute Luncheon
March 13, Noon, Hyatt on Capital Square, $25.00
This luncheon honors Columbus Women of Achievement—women who have made significant contributions in career and/or volunteer roles.

The YWCA is also sponsoring, along with several local organizations, Common Differences: Conversations about Racism and Feminism. The next forum will be March 7, entitled “What is Racism?” For more information, contact Linda Kanney, 224-9121.

“The Women and Alcohol in Literature” lecture/discussion originally scheduled for January 24th has been moved to Saturday, February 28th, 1:00-3:00 pm, 1950-H North Fourth Street (at 18th). For more information, call 291-3639. Sponsored by Women’s Outreach for Women.

Call for Presentations: Domestic Violence in the 80’s - 1987
November 4-6, 1987 Columbus, Ohio

Proposals are now being invited for Domestic Violence in the 80’s - 1987. Proposals are solicited in five general areas: Agency/Coordination, Crisis Intervention, Legal/Judicial/Municipal Issues, Treatment/Support Services, and Prevention/Education. Both basic and advanced levels of presentations are encouraged. For consideration, please submit five copies of the following:

1. a program abstract, a one page summary of presentation or workshop.
2. a program description, fifty words or less. Note basic or advanced level.
3. a list of presenters: name, agency/organization, address, daytime phone, and academic degree.
4. a list of audiovisual equipment needed.

Submit proposals to: DV in the 80’s - 1987, Program Committee, P.O. Box 15673, Columbus, OH 43215.

Proposals should be received no later than March 31, 1987. Notification of acceptance will be made by the end of May 1987. Please note: conference registration fee will be waived for presenters. For further information, call 614/222-7187.
We Need Your Help! Sojourner Reader Survey

In the coming months, the Center for Women's Studies will be evaluating its publications. Please take a moment to give us your suggestions on the Sojourner's future direction.

Subscriptions to the Sojourner are currently free upon request. In the last few years, we have significantly expanded our format and mailing list, both of which mean increased costs. You can help defer some of these costs by making a contribution to the Sojourner.

Please complete and return the survey below. Remember, this is your chance to have an impact on the future of the Sojourner.

1. What is your occupation? ___OSU faculty ___student ___OSU staff
   Other: ____________________________________________________________

2. Sex: _____Female ____Male

3. How many people read your copy of the Sojourner? ______

4. How did you first learn about the Sojourner? ______________________

5. How long have you been a reader?
   _____less than 6 months _____2-3 years
   _____6 months -- 1 year _____3 years or more
   _____1-2 years

6. How did you get this copy of the Sojourner?
   _____subscription
   _____library
   _____friend
   _____other: ______________________________________________________

7. Have you ever written an article for the Sojourner? ___yes ____no

8. What types of features and articles do you enjoy reading the most? (Please check up to 4 responses.)
   _____grants and fellowship information _____feminist research
   _____community news _____news about faculty and staff
   _____interviews _____course offerings
   _____fiction, poetry, and photography _____articles by students
   _____conference information _____personal narratives
   _____other: ____________________________________________________
9. What topics would you like to be featured in future issues of the Sojourner?

- international issues  
  (e.g., South Africa, Central America)
- current feminist research at OSU
- women of color
- women in the media
- resources at OSU for Women
- women and work
- health
- sexuality
- lesbian/gay issues
- social policy and pending legislation
- other: ________________________________________

10. What kind of publication in general would you like the Sojourner to evolve into?

- more scholarly
- more literary/arts
- more news about the Center for Women's Studies
- journal format (research, reviews, etc.)
- community networking information
- other: ________________________________________

11. The Sojourner has undergone major changes in the past two years. In general, do you like the new format?

- yes  
- no

12. Do you have any other comments about the Sojourner?

______________________________________________

- Please add my name to the mailing list.

- I would like to support the Sojourner by making a contribution of
  
  - $5  
  - $10  
  - $25  
  - Other: ______

Name ____________________________________________

Address __________________________________________

________________________________________________

Checks should be made payable to the Center for Women's Studies. Return to: The Sojourner, 207 Dulles Hall, 230 West 17th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Win a Free T-shirt!

Five surveys will be randomly drawn and these respondents will be awarded their very own "Smash Bi-Coastal Arrogance" t-shirt!
Spring Quarter 1987 Course Offerings:
Center for Women's Studies

Women's Studies 201: Introduction to Women's Studies in the Humanities

Women's Studies 201 is an examination of feminist viewpoints through interdisciplinary studies in the humanities and an exploration of the relationship of feminist concepts, methods, and analyses to traditional academic disciplines in the humanities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>M-F</th>
<th>8:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>10-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>12-2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>7-9:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

201N *05 credit hours U
(Not open to students with credit for Women's Studies 202.)

Women's Studies 202: Introduction to Women's Studies in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

Women's Studies 202 will introduce students to the history and content of contemporary feminist thought and will investigate feminist theories that provide alternative perspectives from which to re-examine the basic concepts, issues, methods, and ways of thinking proposed by the traditional social sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>M-F</th>
<th>1:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
<td>8:45-12:00 noon (April 4-June 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05 credit hours
(Not open to students with credit for Women's Studies 201)

Women's Studies 215N: Women Writers: Text and Context

Women Writers is an interdisciplinary inquiry into the nature of female literary tradition and its complex relationship to cultural ideology regarding the status of women, past and present.

Glynis Carr | TR | 7-9:15 |

*05 credit hours
Prerequisites: English 110 or 111 or equivalent; this course may be used for partial fulfillment of the ASC advanced composition requirement. (Not open to students with credit for Comparative Studies 215.01 or 215.02.)

Women's Studies 300: Issues in Women's Health

Issues in Women's Health is an interdisciplinary inquiry into the issues affecting women's health and the politics of gender in the medical health care professions.

Chris Smithies | TR | 2-4:00 |

05 credit hours U
Prerequisites: 201 or 202 recommended

Women's Studies 599N: Senior Seminar

This course will survey the literature, both fiction and non-fiction, of the contemporary women's movement.

Mary Jo Wagner | T | 6:00-9:00 |

05 credit hours UG
Prerequisites: Senior standing, WS 201 or 202 and one additional women's studies course or permission of instructor.
Women's Studies 620: Topics in Feminist Studies: Women and Madness

This course will be an interdisciplinary inquiry into the nature and experience of female madness in patriarchal society. The course will look at ways in which various theories of female madness have functioned as prescriptions for “normal” behavior in women and how the figure of the madwoman has operated in myth, history, and literature. Focus will be on the disparity between actual female experience and the cultural stereotypes surrounding it.

Kris Dugas        MW  4:600 05 credit hours UG
Prerequisites: Women's Studies 201 or 202. Repeatable to a maximum of 15 credit hours.

Additional Courses on Women

Anthropology 810D: Acculturation: Women in Development

This seminar will examine the role of women in developing nations and women's potential impact on economic development. Concerns to be addressed include: The meaning of development for women, division of labor, food production and technology, family size, fertility and family planning, child and maternal nutrition, education, training and women's roles, women and migration—the impact of industrial development on women's roles, work and family life, women's influence on development and change: development strategies.

Erika Bourguignon
Francille Firebaugh       M  100-300 3-5 credit hours G

Engineering 195: Women in Engineering

Students in Engineering 195 will discuss the unique problems facing women engineering students and professionals; resources will be available to deal with these problems.

Marianne Mueller       T  4:00 1 credit hour U

English 592: Women in Literature - Love and Work in Novels about Women by Women

The course will explore how women's work and women's love appeared to British and American women novelists of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century – including those who write about the future – by reading and discussing eight novels.

A. Neumann       M-F  3:00 05 credit hours UG
Prerequisite: English 110 or 111 or equivalent

Hebrew 274: Women in Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature

This course will be an examination of the social, legal, and religious position of women as they appear in ancient Hebrew literature.

Sam Meier       MWF  10:00 03 credit hours U
Prerequisite: English 110 or 111 or equivalent.
History 694B: Women on the American Frontier

This course traces the western migration of pioneer women into Ohio and Indiana, proceeding with the journeys on the overland trail, and the subsequent settlement of the West and Plains states. Emphasis is placed on women's work, building communities, and political activities. In addition the class will consider Native American women, their importance in the economics of the fur trade and exploration of the West, and their displacement after white settlement. Topics also include Hispanic women in the Southwest, migration of Black women into the Western states, and the immigration of Asian women into California and the Northwest.

Mary Jo Wagner TR 2-4:00 05 credit hours UG

History 881N: Seminar in Women's History

This is a continuation of a two-quarter research seminar on women and institutions that began Winter quarter. Only students who registered for winter quarter are eligible.

Leila Rupp T 7-9:00 05 credit hours UG
Prerequisites: graduate standing or permission of instructor,

History of Art 400: Women Artists of the Western World – Renaissance to the Contemporary

A survey course on the works of women artists from the Renaissance to the Contemporary period, with an emphasis on recovering the "lost" knowledge of women's role as artist within the larger context of history, culture, and society.

Judith Beckman TR 3-5:00 05 credit hours U
Prerequisites: Ten hours of Women's Studies or Art History recommended.

Political Science 512: Women and Politics

This course will focus on women in politics in three different contexts. First, we will examine various political theories to see how each one included or excluded women in political life. We will be looking for possible explanations for the different rights accorded to men and women in such areas as property ownership, family life, and governing. Second, we will explore the collective efforts by American women to change their role in society through direct political action. Third, we will study women who are political elites, with special emphasis on women in appointed and elective offices.

Joan McLean M-F 12:00 05 credit hours UG

Social Work 695.10: Integrative Seminar: Women's Issues

Examines the various fields of social work practice; focuses on developing the ability to set practice goals, decide methods of intervention, implement and evaluate consequences.

Ann Foster TR 10-11:30 03 credit hours U
Prerequisite: Senior standing or permission of instructor.

Sociology 435: Sociology of Women

Sociology 435 will examine the nature, causes, and consequences of women's status in American society.

Verta Taylor TR 7-9:15 05 credit hours UG
Prerequisites: Sociology 101 or Women's Studies 201 or 202
The Ohio State University
Center For Women's Studies

Faculty and Teaching Staff, Winter 1987
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