The Women's Movement
Inside and Outside the State

Lee Ann Banaszak

CAMBRIDGE

The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State

LEE ANN BANASZAK
The Pennsylvania State University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521132862

First published 2010

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Banaszak, Lee Ann, 1960–
The women's movement inside and outside the state / Lee Ann Banaszak.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-521-11510-0 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-521-13286-2 (pbk.)
1. Feminism – United States – History. 2. Women in the civil service – United States – History. 3. Women in politics – United States – History. 4. Women social reformers – United States – History. 5. Feminist political geography – United States. 6. Feminist theory – United States. I. Title.
HQ1426.B27 2010
305.420973–dc22 2009015986

ISBN 978-0-521-11510-0 Hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-13286-2 Paperback

To Joyce and Len,
the feminists who raised me

And to Clara and Isaac,
the future generation

Acknowledgments

I am the offspring of the modern women's movement. My mother was among the first women to run for mayor of a major municipality in my home state of Missouri. In middle school I remember the boys joining for the first time our required home economics class. As I considered where to go to college, I received a recruiting letter from West Point urging me to consider being in the second cohort of women there. While I encountered only a few women professors in my undergraduate and graduate studies, they were present enough that I never questioned my own career path. As I entered the ranks of academia, the university child care facilities that allowed me to combine my research with a family life were the product of the battles of an earlier generation of feminists and female academics.

The women's movement I knew from my formative years was one of grassroots activism – women's music festivals, local organizations fighting for the Equal Rights Amendment, and the neighborhood women's health cooperative – and famous feminists like Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan. It was a feminist movement that stood outside of the State, sometimes pressuring it to incorporate feminist policies and often opposing its institutional biases and conservative actions. Yet, on the other hand, I also was cognizant of a growing list of famous women politicians – Bella Abzug, Shirley Chisholm, and (coming from University City, Missouri) Harriett Woods – all of whom I identified less with the women's movement than with the national political scene that fascinated me. Completely off my radar were feminist activists

working inside government, although I now see that they very much influenced my experiences as well.

While the story of second wave feminism has been told by many scholars more skilled than I, the story of this particular set of feminist activists – those that worked within the federal government – has largely remained untold although participants in the movement such as Betty Friedan and Jo Freeman have long noted their existence and the important effects they had on the movement. Where I have been overzealous in stating their achievements (and I do not wish to underplay the important contributions of those outside the state), it is perhaps because their story has been under the radar of most scholars of second wave feminism.

I would not have developed this book without the support of those feminist activists I studied. As should be clear by the description of the development of this project, I owe a great debt to all of the feminists who took the time from their very busy lives to give me a glimpse into their experiences and thoughts, and read my drafts with a careful eye to detail. Despite leading busy lives usually combining activism and the long work days of professional careers, the feminists I interviewed opened their homes to me, handed me valuable primary sources, and were ever accommodating when I would follow up on a specific question even years after the initial interview. I hope that I have done justice to all that they have told me.

There are many feminist activists who served in the federal government but died before I could talk to them: they include Catherine East, Morag Simchak, Caruthers Berger, Marguerite Rawalt, Sylvia Ellison, B. Ann Kleindienst, Elsa Chaney, Barbara Good, Anne Armstrong, and Caroline Cox. Some left extensive archives or oral histories that I could examine; others I know only because they lived in the memory of the activists I interviewed or were briefly mentioned in the historical record. Each of these women came alive, to varying degrees, in the course of my research, and each played important roles in the women's movement from inside the state.

Even with the extensive support provided by these feminist activists, this manuscript could not have been written without the additional help of a number of individuals and institutions. Several social scientists provided valuable assistance during the course of my research. Jo Freeman gave me an initial list of insider feminists to interview and

helped to introduce me to many of the first women I interviewed. Laura Woliver and Betty Glad shared archives from the National Institute of Health's Self Help for Women's Rights organization while Alice S. Rossi aided me in the search to find the data from her 1982 book. Numerous scholars took the time to comment on earlier drafts including Mark Anner, Frank Baumgartner, Karen Beckwith, Francis Chen, Cynthia Harrison, Valerie Jenness, Sally Kenny, Mary Katzenstein, Miki Caul Kittilson, Patrick Le Galès, Joni Lovenduski, Susanne Mettler, John McCarthy, David S. Meyer, Sue Tolleson Rinehart, Dieter Rucht, Marian Sawer, John Skrentny, Winston Tripp, S. Laurel Weldon, Celia Valiente, Angelika von Wahl, and Edward Walker. I am particularly grateful to the three anonymous reviewers for Cambridge University Press who provided me with wonderfully thoughtful comments on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

I am also exceedingly grateful to the graduate and undergraduate students who provided research assistance in the course of my work, including Jeremy Deck, Hilary Ferrel, Corrine Harkcom, Petya Kirilova, Tiffany Yankowski, Aleks Petrykowska, and Marie Pierson. Jiso Yoon deserves special mention, because she provided invaluable aid at the end of the process, helping develop the comparative perspective of the final chapter and undertaking the numerous tasks that are needed to create a polished manuscript.

I have also benefited from comments and suggestions that I received at a number of conferences. Early on, a conference in Social Movements and Public Policy supported by The Center for the Study of Democracy at the University of California Irvine provided initial opportunities to examine the theoretical implications of movement–state intersections. A conference on the American State at Oxford University organized by Des King and Larry Jacobs allowed me to hone the argument about how movement–state intersections have affected the American State. Input from a number of scholars at the first European Conference on Gender and Politics in Belfast convened by Karen Celis and Johanna Kantola helped me better to understand how my research speaks to current feminist scholarship on state feminism. Finally, I have benefited from the input of scholars at successive American Political Science Association meetings where I have presented parts of this research. I would like to particularly thank Joyce Outshoorn, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, Alice Woodward, Laurel Weldon, Eileen

McDonagh, Fiona McKay, Louise Chappell, and Jill Vickers for insightful questions or comments on the work. If any errors or problems remain with the manuscript, it is certainly my own fault and not because I lacked excellent feedback.

Good librarians and archives are vital to any research endeavor, and I have benefited throughout from both the holdings of a number of fine institutions as well as the librarians that make them accessible. The Schlesinger Library at Harvard University's Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study provided a wealth of archives of the modern women's movement and the librarians there – particularly Sarah Hutcheon, Ellen Shea, Diana Carey, Katherine Kraft and Anne Engelhart – were incredibly helpful. At The Pennsylvania State University, Lee Stout helped me locate materials in the "A Few Good Women" collection even as it was being developed; and Helen Sheehy and Stephen Woods in the Social Science library of Paterno Library provided considerable aid, particularly in locating the census and historical materials in Chapter 2. Finally, Heidi Rubenstein at the Lauinger Library of Georgetown University was especially helpful in providing information and locating materials from the Georgetown Foreign Affairs Oral History Project. I have benefited greatly from all of their expertise.

As Virginia Woolf understood, writers (even academics) need a space in which to work. In the course of this project, I have benefited from the provision of physical space offered me by a number of institutions and individuals. Pennsylvania State University has been my academic home from the beginning of this project and deserves much thanks for its support. But I also began and ended this project during research leaves at the Wissenschaftszentrum für Sozialforschung, Berlin. I am particularly grateful to Friedrich Neidhardt who provided me an academic home in 2000 as I was developing the idea of movement–state intersections that eventually became this book, and to Dieter Rucht and Dieter Gosewinkel who hosted me in the Forschungsgruppe Zivilgesellschaft, Citizenship und politische Mobilisierung as I made the final edits. Equally importantly, Anny Wong, Sara Banaszak, and Koa opened their home to me and plied me with good food and conversation during my many research visits to Washington, DC. In all these cases, the intellectual atmosphere was as important as the physical space that was provided.

Other institutions provided the financial means that allowed me to complete this research. Research leaves in 2000 and 2008–09 were funded by The Pennsylvania State University and by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation's Bundeskanzler Fellowship. I also benefited from the financial support provided by a grant from the Research Office of the College of Liberal Arts at Pennsylvania State, which supported travel for interviews and a research assistant. A Research Support Grant from the Schlesinger Library at Harvard University's Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study financed a three-week trip to the library that allowed me to delve deeply into the archives there. In addition, a Carrie Chapman Catt Honorable Mention Prize for Research on Women and Politics helped to pay for additional research assistance at a critical juncture.

I also want to thank those who have helped move the manuscript into published form. Lew Bateman has been wonderfully supportive as an editor throughout the writing process. Mark Fox, Emily Spangler, and Shelby Peak have done a great job of marshalling the manuscript through the production process. Jennifer Carey provided invaluable help with the production of the book. Oxford University Press kindly granted permission for me to republish parts of my chapter "Moving Feminist Activists Inside the American State" from *The Unsustainable American State* edited by Desmond King and Lawrence Jacobs (2009).

Above all, though, this manuscript owes its existence to my family. The Herculean abilities of my spouse Eric Plutzer, who balanced unconditional support for the project with thoughtful criticism while assuming the lion's share of the household tasks and child care during many periods were critical to the manuscript's completion. Isaac Banaszak Plutzer and Clara Banaszak Plutzer also contributed to the manuscript's completion in part with comments (such as the need for more pictures or a catchier title like *Little Dog Lost in Forest*) but more significantly in giving up a large number of days with me while I interviewed, wrote drafts, and polished the manuscript. Thank you for putting up with it all.

Contents

List of Tables and Figures

TABLES

FIGURES

1

Blurring the Conceptual Boundaries between the Women's Movement and the State

In 1966 and 1967, a newly revitalized women's movement organized the first protests that would expand to become a second wave of mobilization. Hundreds of scholarly works have documented, described, and analyzed this movement. The common narrative of these treatments is a familiar one: Despite having a few allies among government officials, feminist activists operated outside of and often in opposition to a government apparatus that contributed to maintaining women's unequal status. Most contemporary accounts of feminist protest events described the movement in these terms as well. A photograph caption in the December 15, 1967 *Washington Post* is consistent with this narrative, both for what it describes but especially for what it omits:

> Mary Eastwood pickets the offices of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission during a demonstration yesterday sponsored by the National Organization for Women. NOW was protesting what it considers the EEOC's discriminatory ruling permitting employees to place job ads under separate Help Wanted – Male, and Help Wanted – Female, columns. Similar demonstrations took place in New York, Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco. (*Washington Post*, December 15, 1967: B3)

There is nothing extraordinary about this caption nor about the accompanying photo showing a woman carrying a sign that says "Equal Employment Opportunity for Women NOW." The picture differs little from others taken at hundreds of feminist protests that occurred across the country during the 1960s and 1970s. However,

there is more to the story than the caption reveals: Mary Eastwood herself was a government employee as were a large percentage of those who planned and organized the event. Both protesters and organizers worked in such places as the Department of Justice, the Department of the Navy, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of Labor. Some of these government employees helped organize events but preferred not to demonstrate, fearing negative consequences from their supervisor (Interview, March 25, 2002).

Most overviews of the women's movement have focused on movement activists *outside* of the government that they are trying to influence (see, for example, Carabillo et al. 1997; Ferree and Hess 2000; Ryan 1992; Tobias 1997). Indeed, the view that social movements are clearly and completely "outside the state[1]" prevails throughout both theoretical and empirical discussions of social movements generally. Yet many, if not most, of the activists picketing on December 15, 1967 were upper-level employees of the federal government. They constituted an important network of women's movement activists who permeated the state and engaged in oppositional actions; they often worked in ways that remained largely unnoticed both by the movement and by the bureaucracy that employed them. Contrary to the view that social movements exist outside the halls of power, this part of the women's movement existed within the state from the movement's inception.

In this book I examine feminist activists who were upper-level government employees in the period from the Kennedy to the Clinton administrations. I show that the boundaries between the state and the movement, often conceptualized as distinguishing two separate collective actors, are fuzzy. More generally, I argue that social movements often overlap with the state through their activists located within the state. In the case of the U.S. women's movement, that overlap had important consequences: It directly influenced the creation of movement organizations, it affected the political opportunities that were available to the movement, and it furthered some policy outcomes while constraining others. Understanding the legacy of the women's

[1] In this chapter, I use the term "the state" in the same way as other scholars in comparative politics to indicate the institution with a monopoly on the legitimate use of force (Moore 1999: 100; Poggi 1990). Generally, when the term is used it does not reference one of the fifty state governments of the United States unless that is clearly signaled.

movement – indeed, any movement – requires the development of a theoretical framework for examining the intersection of the movement and the state, and an empirical assessment of movement politics at this intersection.

I begin this chapter by discussing why scholars and activists need to understand how movements and states overlap. I argue that social movement scholars must pay more careful attention to the intersection between social movements and the state – to what constitutes an insider and an outsider. Otherwise, we are likely to miscategorize parts of the movement as allies, overstate the degree of institutionalization and cooptation in social movements, and exaggerate the relative importance of external factors (such as political opportunities) in comparison to internal movement factors. This miscategorization has the effect of underestimating the agency and influence of many feminist activists. Moreover, it is precisely where movements overlap with the state that one can see most clearly how social movements can mold the state to their own political advantage – *creating* political opportunities that can help them in the future.

While gender scholars have long debated the role of insiders in the women's movement and examined the policy effects of women's policy agencies, I also argue that more attention is needed to individual feminist activists as a form of movement–state intersection and not just to the bureaucratic structures of the state. The presence of women's movement activists influences the way state bureaucratic structures function. Moreover, insider feminist activists are located throughout the state, often outside of agencies devoted to "women's issues," and even in these locations, insider feminist activists had and can have significant influences on policy. Although studying insider feminists is difficult because their actions often occur "under the radar" (see for example Kenney 2008: 717–18), the significance of these networks of individual activists to the women's movement makes the study of individual insider activists necessary.

Finally, I contend that creating a theory of the intersection of social movements and the state requires an examination of different theories of the state and the development of state interests. States are complex institutions, and their many parts have varying capacities to enforce a single set of interests or policies, resulting in internal conflicts and contradictions. Moreover, democratic states offer numerous opportunities

for intersections with social movements because representing societal interests and encouraging at least some level of participation by civil society is one of the state's fundamental functions. Although some areas of the state – such as the bureaucracy – are not considered part of this function, these areas are nevertheless affected by these democratic functions.

After creating the theoretical rationale for this study, I then place the empirical analyses in the book in context by discussing the aspects of women's movements and states that influenced the intersection of these two entities. Because some women are better able to enter the state than others, the part of the women's movement that intersects the state is not representative of the whole movement. This has consequences for the types of policies that ultimately are adopted. I also maintain that the demands of the women's movement can be addressed in multiple locations in the state, allowing feminist activists working in many different parts of the state to utilize their positions to further the movement – even in agencies and departments that had little explicit focus on women. Finally, I emphasize that the state is not static but changes in form and function over time, and organizational changes provide new opportunities for movements that intersect with the state.

I conclude this chapter by discussing the sources of evidence that I use – archival research and in-depth interviews with forty "insider" feminist activists – and outlining the rest of the book. I argue that networks of movement activists within the state played important roles in mobilizing and organizing the movement, altering the political opportunities available to the movement, and creating concrete policy changes that altered the social landscape in the United States.

UNDERSTANDING INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE STATE

Social movements have traditionally been viewed as outsiders to the state (Birnbaum 1988; Burstein, Einwohner, and Hollander 1995; Diani 1992; Flam 1994; Jenkins and Klandermans 1995; Tarrow 1998; Tilly 1978). For example, Diani (1992: 7) notes that definitions of social movements include an emphasis on actions "largely outside the institutional sphere." Such definitions focus on either a movement's existence outside the realm of the state or the use of confrontational

political actions such as protest to distinguish movements from other political actors (Burstein et al. 1995; Goldstone 2003; Katzenstein 1998). Increasingly, though, social movement scholars are examining movements within existing institutions (Meyerson 2003; Moore 1999; Raeburn 2004; Zald and Berger 1987[1978]), and specifically within the state itself (Binder 2002; Goldstone 2003; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Santoro 1999; Santoro and McGuire 1997; Skrentny 2006, 2002; Smith and Lipsky 1993; Wald and Corey 2002; Werum and Winders 2001; Wolfson 2001; Zald 2000).[2]

Women's movement scholars have recognized the intersection between women's movements and the state for much longer, both in the form of women's policy agencies – that is bureaucratic structures that focus on women or women's movement goals (Mazur 1995, 2001, 2002; Pringle and Watson 1992; Sawer 1995; Stetson and Mazur 1995) – and in terms of individual women located within the state, even coining the term "femocrats" to denote such women (see for example Chappell 2002; Eisenstein 1996, 1990; Katzenstein 1998; Outshoorn 1997, 1994; Sawer 1990; Vargas and Wieringa 1998).[3] However, even those works concentrating on individuals often separate feminists inside the state from the movement outside using concepts of iron or velvet triangles (Vargas and Wieringa 1998; Woodward 2003) or focus only on those women in women's policy agencies (Outshoorn 1994; Sawer 1990; Watson 1990).

Taken together, such analyses raise the question of how social movements can be outsiders when they exist inside the halls of power. In this section, I will explain why the intersection between movements and state needs to be reconceptualized and develop the concept as a *variable*

[2] Interest group scholars have also long recognized the interconnectiveness of traditional interest groups and the U.S. government, both through the capture of governmental offices by interest groups (e.g., McConnell 1970; Stigler 1975) and through the career paths of individuals who move from the bureaucracy to lobbying organizations and vice versa (see, for example, Heinz et al 1993 and Salisbury and Johnson 1989).

[3] The definition of "femocrat," used outside the United States, varies quite widely by author and some definitions do not require a connection to the women's movement. Here the feminist activists that I delineate are activists in an autonomous movement; we know this because comparatively we know that a strong women's movement has existed independent of the government in the United States, and the criteria for the feminist activists in this study is that they were an active part of that independent movement.