

CAWP News & Notes

CENTER for the
AMERICAN
WOMAN and
POLITICS

Spring 1992
Vol. 8 No. 2

CONTENTS

The 1992 Elections

If It's Campaign Time, It Must Be...A Season of Progress	1
Who are the Women Candidates for Congress? (A List in Formation)	3
Resources for Women Candidates	8
Women's PACs: A Contact List	10

CAWP Activities

A Challenge for Change: CAWP's Forum for Women State Legislators	13
Building Women's Institutions	15

CAWP Releases Studies

The Impact of Women in Public Office	16
Abortion Politics in Elections	18

The Next Generation of Women Leaders

CAWP's NEW Leadership Program: The First Year	19
Reflections on NEW Leadership Summer Institute	
A Student's Perspective	20
An Advisor's View	21
Women and Public Leadership: The Missing Piece	22
How — and Why — to Recruit a Female Intern	23
Young Women and Public Leadership: Organizations Taking Action	24

Of Interest

Women's Global Leadership Institute: Petition Drive Continues	26
Women's Legislative Caucuses: An Update	27

Subscriber Information Service (SIS) enclosures

The Impact of Women in Public Office: Findings at a Glance • Abortion Politics in State Elections: Executive Summary • CAWP Forum tape order form • CAWP Forum newspaper clips • Global Center petition • CAWP fact sheets: Women in Elective Office 1992; Women in the U.S. Congress 1992; Statewide Elective Executive Women 1992; Women in State Legislatures 1992; Women in Legislative Leadership 1991; Summary of Women Candidates for Selected Offices. (New subscribers also receive: Women Candidates for Congress 1970-1990; Women Candidates for Governor 1970-1990; Women Moving into State Legislatures; Women Candidates for State Legislatures 1974-1980, 1986-1990.)

About CAWP

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. CAWP is a leading authority in its field and a respected bridge between the academic and political worlds.

Before CAWP was founded in 1971, no organization or educational institution was compiling information about women in government and politics or studying and monitoring the status and prospects of those women. Today, CAWP has taken on the multiple roles of catalyst and resource, provider of data and analyses, interpreter and guide. CAWP raises and responds to emerging issues, working daily with women leaders as well as journalists, scholars, students, women's groups, governmental agencies, civic organizations, and political parties.

CAWP's major programs and activities include: a clearinghouse about women in politics and government; a data bank on women in public office; research about women in leadership; national surveys of elected and appointed women; an ongoing Program for Women State Legislators; a Subscriber Information Service and newsletter; conferences and seminars; programs for college and high school students; a specialized library collection about women in public life; books, monographs, reports, fact sheets, a documentary film; consulting services.

Eagleton Institute of Politics

Since its founding in 1956, the Eagleton Institute has built a national reputation for its graduate fellowship program and for its research and public service activities in the field of American politics. The Institute houses three major centers (CAWP; the Center for Public Interest Polling; and the Center for Policy Research in Education) and a number of special programs about American public policy and the political process.

We apologize for the delay in getting this issue of *CAWP News & Notes* out to our subscribers.

We assure you that you will receive three issues for your \$20 subscription. The next edition of *CAWP News & Notes* is scheduled to come out late this summer or early this fall.

CAWP Staff

Ruth B. Mandel, *Director and Professor*
Lucy D. Baruch, *Editor, CAWP News & Notes and Information Services Coordinator*
Susan J. Carroll, *Senior Research Associate and Associate Professor*
Martha Casisa, *Secretary*
Joan A. Crowley, *Director of Development*
Debra L. Dodson, *Senior Research Associate and Assistant Research Professor*
Katherine E. Kleeman, *Senior Program Associate*
Michele A. Treadwell, *Secretary*
Debbie Walsh, *Director, Program for Women State Legislators*

If It's Campaign Time, It Must Be...A Season of Progress

Ruth B. Mandel, Director, CAWP

An election year again. Phone messages from reporters stack up. The angles are slightly different every week or two, sometimes every day or two, depending on story lines circulating among media outlets.

Late in 1991, women-and-politics stories proliferated rapidly, most of them rooted in the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill confrontation. Our pink phone slips kept the record of questions. Would the hearings have been different if women held half the seats on the Judiciary Committee? Would the confirmation vote have been different in a coed Senate? Will more women run for high office after the nation's dramatic visual encounter with an all-male Senate Judiciary Committee and a 98 percent male U.S. Senate? What's the explanation for women's support of Clarence Thomas in the public opinion polls? Do women elected officials do more than men in office to solve problems like sexual harassment in the workplace? Will the strong emotions aroused by the hearings fizzle out, or will there be lasting consequences to the events of October 1991? What next steps are women taking?

The new year still brings questions about whether last autumn's angry energy has evaporated or spilled over into the politics of 1992. But most inquiries refer to current events — questions about politics surrounding the Supreme Court's pending abortion decision; the political role and clout of NOW as it celebrates its 25th anniversary; the role of women in the '92 presidential campaigns; expectations surrounding political spouses; Hillary Clinton as spouse extraordinaire; opportunities for women candidates this year; why women are not running for president in the two major parties; sources of money for women's campaigns; the "backlash" against women and/or feminism; the gender gap in the early Republican presidential primaries; and the impact of the Clinton "character issue" on women voters.

This is only the beginning. Our phones at CAWP will ring almost daily for the next year with requests for observation and analysis, background information, history, statistics and current data, good sources, and

names of women candidates and officeholders. And more. Today large portions of CAWP staff time are devoted to answering media inquiries. It is a job we enjoy. Greater numbers of calls also mean growing interest in women's political activities.

Attention to women in the political world has been increasing for some years. Women are not a recent media discovery. We all recall the journalistic flurries around special moments over the last twenty years. The Equal Rights Amendment ratification campaign received media attention. Sandra Day O'Connor's nomination and confirmation to the Supreme Court did not pass unnoticed. In 1984, *Newsweek*, *Time*, and *U.S. News & World Report* ran cover stories about Geraldine Ferraro's vice presidential nomination.

But today there is a difference. Women do not have to record an historic defeat or breakthrough to attract attention. Whether the day's headline is the recession, the President's State of the Union address, or the growing national crises in health care and education, women's voices are heard increasingly in our public discourse. The movement of women into the public domain over the past twenty years may well be described as an emergence from invisibility to scattered visibility, and from voicelessness to some influence.

By 1992 women have achieved influence in American politics. That influence is evident in the growing presence of women in public office and in political campaigns as well as in the attention given to women's voting habits and public opinions. These days candidates target political ads to female constituents and give lip service to women's perceived concerns. These days, after an outcry from women, the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee will do an about turn and hold additional Supreme Court confirmation hearings on a charge of sexual harassment.

The Judiciary Committee's about turn even surpasses influence to represent a rare moment of power for women in American politics. Perhaps more important for 1992, that fleeting moment of power left behind an appetite for more. Because it was followed by hours of what many saw as stark powerlessness for women in the nation's highest deliberative processes, the infamous weekend in October was a reminder that gaining influence does not mean achieving power.

The elections of 1992 might be propitious for playing out a confluence of concerns to the advantage of women in politics. "Might" is a key conditional term here. While general circumstances do point to a banner election year for women, the necessary and sufficient political specifics may not be in place to make this year markedly different from all the generally good years for women in politics over the past two decades.

Nevertheless, 1992 does seem special, at least on its early calendar pages. Although they remain vulnerable to its influence, voters say they are disgusted with negative campaigning and would welcome a realistic alternative to politics as usual. They believe that politicians lie to them, making campaign promises they cannot keep. They are angry with incumbents as a class, viewing them as responsible for a government which they perceive as wanting more money from them without giving them more good life in return. They believe that incumbents are also personally on the take. While drives for term limitations are symptomatic of these ill feelings about elected officials in general, patterns of reelecting one's own incumbent representative have typically been strong. This year may prove different, and the overall picture next fall may be more than slightly altered by the voters' mood for cleaning house.

Voters may be looking for new faces, especially people who represent new solutions and fresh ideas. Because women remain such a small percentage of elected officials at any level of office (in early 1992, six percent in the Congress, eighteen percent in statewide elective offices and in state legislatures), they are still newcomers representing a potential for change. Furthermore, women are associated with the types of issues which have emerged at the top of the domestic policy agenda this year — jobs and family security, education, and — yes — health care. Health care is a myriad of issues, and women are closely associated with all of them as professionals, service providers, consumers, and as victims of the system. The areas of the health care crisis from which women are distanced, in fact, are those many people view as the source of the problem, namely the medical profession and the insurance industry, both still centers of male power. Could the image of women as the nation's nursing, social work and teaching corps turn in women's political

favor? Will an inward turn to domestic issues impel voters to look for ways to shift power for solving domestic problems and insuring our social well being away from lawyers, bankers, businessmen and real estate interests? Late last year, E.J. Dionne reported in *The Washington Post* that a survey conducted by the Times Mirror Center for the People & the Press found over two thirds of respondents agreeing we would be better off as a nation if more women were in Congress. Furthermore, he wrote, "the poll offered descriptions of various kinds of individuals and asked respondents whether the person described would be 'a very good candidate.' Consistently, the female version ran better than the male version of the same hypothetical candidate. For example, a woman described as a 'business executive named person of the year by the Chamber of Commerce' ran 10 percentage points better than a man described in the same way" (*The Washington Post*, December 4, 1991). Public opinion polls have found voters supportive of women in politics for some time now, but this sort of "female advantage" in a head-to-head match up is something quite new. Of course, before attitudes expressed in surveys translate into real voting behavior, the appeal of particular women and men, the demographics of particular districts, and the influence of partisanship will weigh into decisions on election day.

A generally positive attitude toward women is not enough. Above and beyond everything, no voter can favor a woman unless her name is on the ballot. This year, redistricting gives candidate newcomers some opportunities not available in election seasons for another decade. But even if the moment, the issues, the attitudes and the voters are right for female candidates in 1992, large numbers of women will not win elections unless large numbers of women have been nominated. These nominations, at least the ones for competitive and paying offices, usually come after years of laying the groundwork inside the districts, political parties, and networks of organizational and financial support. Some political women have done just that and are well positioned to run in '92. We will see them on ballots all across the country, their numbers increasing incrementally as they have been each election season for the past twenty years.

This year we may also see some additional women's candidacies, perhaps some less painstakingly prepared,

candidacies inspired by the events of October 1991 or fueled by an amalgam of current political atmospherics and voter frustration. Numbers of winners next November could well climb proportionately higher than in the last few elections. But I would not make too much of that. Women have entered a long and slow process, one which offers few real shortcuts to political power.

Inevitably, the media will report that this could be the "Year of the Woman" in politics. That prediction has made the rounds each and every election season for

years. I always find myself in the same unglamorous position, cautioning: No, no avalanche of women will win in November. Yet across the board, women will gain positions in public office. No single year is *THE YEAR* of the woman in politics. No one year will elevate women to parity in political leadership. On the other hand, it is fair to claim *every* election year since 1970 as a year of women in politics. For over a generation now, each and every year inaugurates a season of progress for political women. Painstaking progress, slow progress, incremental progress. Yet steady progress. In this generation of gains for women's leadership, 1992 will take its place. There will be no turning back or standing still. We are not done yet.

Who are the Women Candidates for Congress? (A List in Formation)

Lucy Baruch, Information Services Coordinator, CAWP
Angela Scott, Student Intern, CAWP

In order for 1992 to be a record year for women receiving *major party nominations* (not just filing as candidates) for the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House, 11 women must win major party nominations for the Senate and 71 women must win major party nominations for the House. (A record 10 women won Senate nominations in 1984 and a record 70 women won House nominations in 1990.)

Thus far we have confirmed that 20 women are running for the U.S. Senate and 131 are running for the U.S. House. In addition, there are at least 21 other women who may be running for House seats but have not yet announced their candidacies. It is too soon to tell precisely how 1992 will compare with other years because it is likely that later in the election season more women candidates will be identified, some will drop out of their races, and others will lose their primaries.

Watch for election updates in upcoming issues of *CAWP News & Notes* to see if women set records in 1992. Since CAWP has already identified 20 women of color who have filed for congressional races, we'll also be watching to see if more women of color than ever before win major party nominations.

As of April 1, 1992, filing deadlines have passed in only 18 states and congressional primaries have been held in only 4 states. Information on women candidates *filing* for congressional races will not be complete until August, when the final state filing deadline will have passed. Information on *major party nominees* will not be complete until October, when the final state will have held its primary.

The following list includes preliminary information about Democratic and Republican women running for Congress in 1992. The list is comprised of confirmed candidates only; it does not include candidates who filed but subsequently lost their primaries.

Please note: users of our information should credit the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. The names of the incumbents appear in bold.

Women Candidates for the U.S. Senate — 20 (17D, 3R)

1 Black; 17 White; 2 Race Unknown

<u>St</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Candidate (party)</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Primary Date</u>	<u>Primary Won</u>
AL	US Sen.	Mrs. Frank Ross Stewart (D)	4/3	6/2	
AR	US Sen.	Julia Hughes Jones (D)	6/1	8/25	
AZ	US Sen.	Claire Sargent (D)	6/25	9/8	
CA	US Sen.	Barbara Boxer (D)	3/6	5/26	
CA	US Sen.	Dianne Feinstein (D) (2 year term)	3/6	5/26	
IA	US Sen.	Rosanne Freeburg (D)	3/13	6/2	
IA	US Sen.	Jean Lloyd-Jones (D)	3/13	6/2	
IL	US Sen.	Carol Moseley Braun (D)	12/16/91	3/17	WON
MD	US Sen.	Barbara Mikulski (D)	12/23/91	3/3	WON
MO	US Sen.	Carol Coe (D)	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Sen.	Barbara Manson (D)	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Sen.	Geri Rothman-Serot (D)	3/31	8/6	
NC	US Sen.	Sue Myrick (R)	2/3	5/5	
NY	US Sen.	Geraldine Ferraro (D)	7/16	9/15	
NY	US Sen.	Elizabeth Holtzman (D)	7/16	9/15	
OR	US Sen.	Stephanie Salvey (R)	3/10	5/19	
PA	US Sen.	Freddy Mann Friedman (D)	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Sen.	Lynn Yeakel (D)	2/18	4/28	
SD	US Sen.	Charlene Haar (R)	4/7	6/2	
WA	US Sen.	Patty Murray (D)	7/31	9/17	

Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives — 131 (91D, 40R)

2 Asian/Pacific American; 13 Black; 3 Hispanic; 1 Native American; 55 White; 57 Race Unknown

<u>St</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Candidate (party)</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Primary Date</u>	<u>Primary Won</u>
AL	US Rep.	Faye Baggiano (D)	002	4/3	6/2	
AR	US Rep.	Blanche Lambert (D)	001	3/31	5/26	
AR	US Rep.	Janet Martin (D)	003	3/31	5/26	
CA	US Rep.	Jacqueline J. Carpenter (R)	003	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Patricia Malberg (D)	004	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Anna Nevenic (D)	006	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Lynn Woolsey (D)	006	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Nancy Pelosi (D)	008	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Ayn Weiskamp (D)	010	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Patti Garamendi (D)	011	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Cleo Nichol Robinson (D)	011	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Sandy Smoley (R)	011	3/6	6/2	

Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives (continued)

<u>St</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Candidate (party)</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Primary Date</u>	<u>Primary Won</u>
CA	US Rep.	Anna G. Eshoo (D)	014	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Gloria Ochoa (D)	022	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Daphne Becker (R)	023	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Anita Perez Ferguson (D)	023	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Helen Hernandez (D)	030	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Leticia Quezada (D)	030	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Lucy F. Kihm (D)	033	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)	033	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Maxine Waters (D)	035	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Joan Milke Flores (R)	036	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Jane Harman (D)	036	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Maureen Reagan (R)	036	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Charlene A. Richards (D)	036	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Ada Unruh (D)	036	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Vera Robles DeWitt (D)	037	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Lynn Dymally (D)	037	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Molly McClanahan (D)	039	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Raven Lopez Workman (D)	043	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Georgia Smith (D)	044	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Patricia McCabe (D)	045	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Judith M. Ryan (R)	046	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Judy Jarvis (R)	049	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Carol J. Lucke (D)	049	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Lynn Schenk (D)	049	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Bea Herbert (D)	051	3/6	6/2	
CA	US Rep.	Janet M. Gastil (D)	052	3/6	6/2	
CO	US Rep.	Pat Schroeder (D)	001	6/5	8/11	
CT	US Rep.	Barbara Kennelly (D)	001	8/12	9/8	
CT	US Rep.	Rosa DeLauro (D)	003	8/12	9/8	
CT	US Rep.	Lynn Taborska (D)	005	8/12	9/8	
CT	US Rep.	Nancy Johnson (R)	006	8/12	9/8	
DC	US Rep.	Eleanor H. Norton (D) (non-voting)	AL	2/25	9/1	
DE	US Rep.	Janet C. Rzewnicki (R)	AL	7/31	9/12	
FL	US Rep.	Cheryl Davis Knapp (D)	009	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Stephanie Slavin (D)	010	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Gwen Margolis (D)	017	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Lois Frankel (D)	NA	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Carrie Meek (D)	NA	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Karen Moffitt (D)	NA	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R)	018?	7/10	9/1	
FL	US Rep.	Karen Thurman (D)	NA	7/10	9/1	
GA	US Rep.	Barbara Howard Christmas (D)	001	5/1	6/16	
GA	US Rep.	Cathey Steinberg (D)	004	5/1	6/16	
GA	US Rep.	Isabelle Watkins (D)	010	5/1	6/16	
GA	US Rep.	Cynthia McKinney (D)	011	5/1	6/16	

Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives (continued)

<u>St</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Candidate (party)</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Primary Date</u>	<u>Primary Won</u>
HI	US Rep.	Patsy Mink (D)	002	7/21	9/19	
IA	US Rep.	Elaine Baxter (D)	003	3/13	6/2	
IL	US Rep.	Hildegard Rodriguez-Schieman (R)	004	12/16/91	3/17	WON
IL	US Rep.	Cardiss Collins (D)	007	12/16/91	3/17	WON
IN	US Rep.	Jill Long (D)	004	2/21	5/5	
IN	US Rep.	J. Carolyn Williams (D)	004	2/21	5/5	
IN	US Rep.	Natalie M. Bruner (D)	006	2/21	5/5	
IN	US Rep.	Ellen Wedum (D)	007	2/21	5/5	
KS	US Rep.	Jan Meyers (R)	003	6/10	8/4	
KY	US Rep.	Susan Stokes (R)	003	1/29	5/26	
KY	US Rep.	Carol Brown Hubbard (D)	005	1/29	5/26	
MD	US Rep.	Helen Delich Bentley (R)	002	12/23/91	3/3	WON
MD	US Rep.	Michele Dyson (R)	004	12/23/91	3/3	WON
MD	US Rep.	Connie Morella (R)	008	12/23/91	3/3	WON
ME	US Rep.	Linda Bean (R)	001	4/1	6/9	
ME	US Rep.	Dottie Chaisson McGuirk (R)	001	4/1	6/9	
ME	US Rep.	Olympia J. Snowe (R)	002	4/1	6/9	
MI	US Rep.	Barbara-Rose Collins (D)	013	5/12	8/4	
MN	US Rep.	Elaine Prom (R)	001	7/21	9/15	
MO	US Rep.	Joan Kelly Horn (D)	002	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Rep.	Susan Johnson (D)	002	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Rep.	Dina Cox (D)	005	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Rep.	Joyce Lea (R)	005	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Rep.	Patricia Danner (D)	006	3/31	8/6	
MO	US Rep.	Sandra Lee Reeves (D)	006	3/31	8/6	
MS	US Rep.	Dorothy "Dot" Benford (R)	002	1/10	3/10	WON
NC	US Rep.	Eva Clayton (D)	001	2/3	5/5	
NC	US Rep.	Vicky Goudie (R)	004	2/3	5/5	
NC	US Rep.	Roberta Robin Hood (D)	012	2/3	5/5	
NC	US Rep.	Barbara Gore Washington (R)	012	2/3	5/5	
NJ	US Rep.	Marge Roukema (R)	005	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Grace Applegate (R)	006	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Barbara Jensen (D)	006	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Karen Carroll (D)	007	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Clare Lagermasini (D)	008	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Nancy Harrigan (D)	009	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Mary Frueholz (D)	011	4/9	6/2	
NJ	US Rep.	Ona Spiridellis (D)	011	4/9	6/2	
NV	US Rep.	Barbara Vucanovich (R)	002	5/12	9/1	
NY	US Rep.	Susan Molinari (R)	014	7/16	9/15	
NY	US Rep.	Nita Lowey (D)	020	7/16	9/15	
NY	US Rep.	Louise Slaughter (D)	030	7/16	9/15	

Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives (continued)

<u>St</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Candidate (party)</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Primary Date</u>	<u>Primary Won</u>
OH	US Rep.	Margaret R. Mueller (R)	011	2/20	5/5	
OH	US Rep.	Marcy Kaptur (D)	009	2/20	5/5	
OH	US Rep.	Mary Rose Oakar (D)	020	2/20	5/5	
OR	US Rep.	Elizabeth Furse (D)	001	3/10	5/19	
PA	US Rep.	C. Delores Tucker (D)	002	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Susan Boyer (R)	013	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Marjorie Mezvinsky (D)	013	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Constance Komm (D)	018	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Susan Roach (D)	018	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Mary Ann McDaniels-Kulesa (D)	021	2/18	4/28	
PA	US Rep.	Suzanne Hayden (R)	022	2/18	4/28	
SC	US Rep.	Elizabeth Patterson (D)	004	4/30	6/9	
SC	US Rep.	Delores Porcher-DaCosta (R)	NA	4/30	6/9	
TN	US Rep.	Marilyn Lloyd (D)	003	5/21	8/6	
TX	US Rep.	Donna Peterson (R)	002	1/6	3/10	WON
TX	US Rep.	Jeannie Sadowski (R)	017	1/6	3/10	WON
TX	US Rep.	Dolly Madison McKenna (R)	025	1/6	3/10	WON
TX	US Rep.	Lucy Cain (R)	030	1/6	3/10	WON
TX	US Rep.	Eddie Bernice Johnson (D)	030	1/6	3/10	WON
UT	US Rep.	Olene Walker (R)	002	4/15	9/8	
UT	US Rep.	Karen Shepherd (D)	020	4/15	9/8	
VA	US Rep.	Jean Cunningham (D)	003	4/10	6/9	
VA	US Rep.	Jacqueline Epps (D)	003	4/10	6/9	
VA	US Rep.	Jessie Rattley (D)	003	4/15	6/9	
VA	US Rep.	Donna Erickson (R)	006	4/10	6/9	
VA	US Rep.	Leslie Byrne (D)	011	4/10	6/9	
WA	US Rep.	Maria Cantwell (D)	001	7/31	9/17	
WA	US Rep.	Jolene Unsoeld (D)	003	7/31	9/17	
WA	US Rep.	Jennifer Dunn (R)	008	7/31	9/17	
WA	US Rep.	Pam Roach (R)	008	7/31	9/17	
WI	US Rep.	Ada Deer (D)	002	7/14	9/8	
WI	US Rep.	Barb Gronemus (D)	003	7/14	9/8	

For state-by-state historical information, see CAWP fact sheets on women candidates for: Congress; statewide elective executive offices; and state legislatures.

For current and historical information about women officeholders, see CAWP fact sheets on women in: Congress; statewide elective executive offices; state legislatures; state legislative leadership; county government; and municipal offices.

Resources for Women Candidates

Women candidates and their staffs regularly turn to CAWP for information. Because we've been told repeatedly that women who run for office are expected to be "experts" on women in politics, we send a packet of materials. These include our fact sheets on women candidates and officeholders as well as a list of women's PACs (see below) and kits on "Bringing More Women into Public Office" and the "Impact of Women in Public Office." In addition, we pass on information about several other resources.

Around the country, a number of organizations are working to encourage women to run for office. Some offer training programs for women candidates and/or their staffs. In addition, several books and pamphlets may be of interest. The following selected list of resources comes largely from promotional materials issued by the organizations or the publishers.

National Organizations

Democratic National Committee (DNC)

Although the DNC does not offer training programs designed specifically for women, available materials and training programs should be of interest to women candidates and their staffs. For information, contact Nancy Kirshner, DNC, 20 Ivy Street, SE, Washington, DC 20003, (202) 863-8000.

National Federation of Republican Women's (NFRW) Campaign Management Schools

The NFRW offers one and two-day workshops with an emphasis on state and local campaigns. The campaign schools, held around the country, cover such areas as: fundraising; scheduling; press relations; image; working with volunteers; research; headquarters management; advertising; and strategy. A comprehensive campaign manual is included with the registration fee. For additional information, contact Susie Lewis, NFRW, CMS, 124 North Alfred Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, (703) 548-9688.

National Organization for Women (NOW)

Although there is no formal training program scheduled, NOW does offer candidate trainings from time to time. For information, contact Alice Cohan, Political Director, NOW, 1000 16th Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-5705, (202) 331-0066.

National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC) Candidate Training for Women

NWPC's series of Candidate Trainings for Women has reached hundreds of women who wish to move up the political pipeline. Participants learn:

- how to create a campaign plan and structure
- how to hire campaign workers and find and motivate skilled, enthusiastic volunteers
- how to identify and target persuadable voters who are likely to turn out on election day
- how to contact and cultivate voters through the campaign season, using direct mail, phone calls, paid advertisements, and precinct canvassing — and get them to the polls
- how to raise money on a shoestring budget through direct mail, phone calls, advertisements and special events
- how to get and handle political coverage in the media
- how to develop issue positions and convey these positions through effective personal appearances and speeches.

Candidate trainings, including sessions designed specifically to meet the needs of women of color running for office, are taking place in cities across the country. *Political Campaigning — A New Decade: The NWPC Guide to Winning in the 90s* is given to training participants; others may order the book from the NWPC. For additional information, contact Elizabeth Arledge, Director of Training, NWPC, 1275 K Street, NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 898-1100. Also contact state chapters for local information.

Republican National Committee (RNC) — Women Who Win '92

Administered by the office of Jeanie Austin, Co-Chair of the RNC, Women Who Win '92 is a full-day training for Republican women leaders who want to be more

confident and effective communicators. The training program covers: fundraising; communications; press relations; public speaking; and campaign organization. For additional information, contact Mary Schwartz, Office of the Co-Chairman, Republican National Committee, 310 First Street, SE, Washington, DC 20003, (202) 863-8545.

Women's Campaign Fund

The Women's Campaign Fund is the oldest women's PAC in the country and has, for two decades, been recruiting, training, and providing funds to women candidates. For information, contact the Women's Campaign Fund, 120 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC 20002, (202) 544-4484.

YWCA Institute for Public Leadership

The YWCA Institute for Public Leadership is designed to train women for political leadership, whether running for office, managing a campaign or gaining public support for women's issues. The Institute for Public Leadership (IPL) was initiated by the YWCA of the U.S.A. to train women of all backgrounds for positions in public life. In addition to sponsoring the political workshops, IPL works to advance a national agenda for the 1990s focusing on social justice, public leadership and change on behalf of women and their families.

Held in various cities across the country, IPL's day and one-half, two track program deals with:

- deciding whether to run for office
- preparing your family for the campaign
- devising winning strategy and tactics
- recruiting and managing volunteers
- polling and targeting to find your voters
- setting up canvasses and phone banks
- getting the most from the media
- using computers to manage information
- raising the money to finance your cause
- advocating for your issues in your community.

The program is designed as a hands-on workshop rather than a lecture series. All sessions use slides, videotapes, role plays, and exercises. Candidates assess their chances to win, practice presentation skills, and wrestle with the tough issues. Managers weigh strategy

decisions, role-play personnel problems, and create campaign materials. For additional information, contact the YWCA Institute for Public Leadership, YWCA of the U.S.A., 726 Broadway, New York, NY 10003, (212) 614-2779.

Published Materials

Campaigning for Office: A Woman Runs and 101 Campaign Tips for Women Candidates and Their Staffs

Jewel Lansing, who held elective office for twelve years and who ran for statewide office in Oregon, has written two books for and about women as candidates. *Campaigning for Office* goes inside Lansing's statewide campaign to describe how a woman juggles family, job and the roller-coaster life of a candidate. *101 Campaign Tips* offers hard-nosed practical advice about running an effective campaign along with real-life examples from around the country. Half of the author's royalties from the books will be contributed to organizations, including CAWP, which are committed to helping more women get elected to office. The books, both published in 1991, may be purchased from R&E Publishers, P.O. Box 2008, Saratoga, CA 95070. The price is \$9.95/book plus \$2.50 shipping for the first book and \$.50 shipping for each additional book (California residents should add 7% sales tax).

In the Running: The New Woman Candidate

Drawing on lively first-person accounts of women who have campaigned for many levels of office across the country, *In the Running* reveals the difficulties of creating a public image when the "right" image has always been male, shows how women's private lives are given greater scrutiny than those of their male opponents, and explains why women have a harder time asking for and securing all-important campaign dollars. Written by Ruth B. Mandel, Director of the Center for the American Woman and Politics and published in the early 1980s, *In the Running* is still a valuable tool. The price is \$10.00; checks should be made payable to CAWP and sent to CAWP, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901.

Political Campaigning — A New Decade: The National Women's Political Caucus Guide to Winning in the 90s.

Political Campaigning is a concise primer on how to run campaigns. From the computer revolution to dealing with negative attacks, this hands-on book offers the seasoned incumbent as well as the first-time candidate advice about how to develop a message, an organization, and a strategy for winning on election day. Written by Cathy Allen and released in 1990, the book can be ordered for \$29.95 plus \$4.00 shipping and handling. Checks should be sent to NWPC Leadership Development, Education and Research Fund, 1275 K Street NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005.

Storming the Statehouse: Running for Governor with Ann Richards and Dianne Feinstein

Written by Celia Morris and published by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1992. (Editor's note: promotional materials were not in hand at press time.)

Thinking of Running for Congress? A Guide for Democratic Women

Written and published in 1991 by EMILY's List, a donor network for Democratic women, this booklet was

designed to help potential women candidates evaluate the political feasibility of the race and make sound early decisions key to a winning campaign. The price is \$3.00 (DC residents should add 6% sales tax). Available from EMILY's List, 1112 16th Street, NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20036.

Women as Candidates in American Politics

This scholarly book examines political parties' recruitment of women candidates, the factors that affect the outcomes of women's primary election campaigns, the future officeholding ambitions of women candidates, and women candidates' views on women's issues. The study is based on a nationwide survey of women who ran as major party candidates for congressional, statewide, and state legislative offices in 1976. Written by Susan J. Carroll, a Senior Research Associate at the Center for the American Woman and Politics and an Associate Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, *Women as Candidates* was published in 1985. The price is \$8.95 for paper and \$35.00 for cloth plus \$2.50 shipping and handling; available from Indiana University Press, 10th & Morton Streets, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Women's PACs: A Contact List

American Nurses' Association, Inc. (ANA-PAC)

Contact: Donna Richardson
600 Maryland Ave., SW, Ste. 100 West
Washington, DC 20024-2571
(202) 554-4444

East Bay Women's Political Action Committee

Contact: Helen Tirsell, President
5736 Chelton Drive
Oakland, CA 94611
(510) 482-4941

Eleanor Roosevelt Fund of California

Contact: Andrea Leiderman
1001-158 Evelyn Terrace East
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
(408) 773-9791

EMILY's List

Contact: Karin Johanson, Political Director
1112 16th Street, NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 887-1957

GOP Women's Political Action League

Contact: Maureen Reagan, Chair
P.O. Box 66011
Washington, DC 20035
(202) 785-8242

Hollywood Women's Political Committee

Contact: Margery Tabankin, Executive Director
10536 Culver Boulevard, Suite 1
Culver City, CA 90232
(213) 559-9334

HOPE-PAC

Contact: Maria Contreras-Sweet, President
611 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1202
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 267-5853

Latina PAC

Contact: Maria Ochoa, Co-chair
915 L Street, Suite C-222
Sacramento, CA 95814
(714) 554-6064

Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Nettie Becker, Co-chair
150 El Camino Drive, Suite 110
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
(213) 275-4042

Marin County Women's PAC

Contact: Johanna Willmann, Chair
4 Third Street
Sausalito, CA 94965
(415) 331-7974

Michigan Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Mary Fowlie, President
2600 W. Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
(313) 637-2534

Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Tracy Whitehead, Chair
550 Rice Street
St. Paul, MN 55103
(612) 222-1603

Missouri Women's Action Fund

Contact: Vivian Eveloff, First Vice-chair
1108 Hillside Drive
St. Louis, MO 63117
(314) 781-1081

National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs (BPW/PAC)

Contact: Mariwyn Heath, BPW/PAC Chair
2012 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 293-1100, ext.: Gov't Relations

National Organization for Women

Contact: Alice Cohan
Political Director
1000 16th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-5705
(202) 331-0066

National Political Congress of Black Women

Contacts: Shirley Chisholm, Chair
Portia Dempsey, Executive Director
P.O. Box 411
Rancocas, NJ 08073
(609) 871-1500

National Women's Political Caucus

Contact: Hariett Woods, President
1275 K Street, NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 898-1100

Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Susan Nenstiel, Treasurer
537 West Diamond Avenue
Hazleton, PA 18201
(717) 455-3100 (O)
(717) 454-2755 (H)

Republican Women's PAC

Contact: Diann Rogers
P.O. Box 163192
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 447-8186

PAC is currently inactive.

Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Linda Turnquist, President
P.O. Box 162212
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 445-5598

Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee

Contact: Susan Rose, Vice President-elect
928 Las Palmas Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
(805) 682-6769

The Sullivan PAC

Contact: Stephanie Cartwright
18600 Sheffield Road
Castro Valley, CA 94546
(510) 886-3082

Task Force 2000 PAC

Contact: P.O. box 36183
Houston, TX 77036
(713) 782-7004

Wednesday Committee

Contact: Adrianna Babior
1531 Purdue
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(213) 477-8081

The Wednesday Committee is not a PAC; it is a network of women's PACs in the Los Angeles area.

WISH List

Contact: Glenda Greenwald, President
730 Columbus Ave. - PMC Ste. 187
New York, NY 10025
(212) 794-9385

WISH List (IL)

Contact: Peg McDonnell Breslin
1700 Champlain
Ottawa, IL 61350
(815) 433-0534

PAC is currently inactive.

Women For:

Contact: Marilyn Kizziah or Lucie Bava
8913 West Olympic Boulevard, Ste. 103
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
(213) 657-7411

Women For: Orange County

Contact: Francesjane "FJ" Kapsch, Vice-chair
13681 Carlstad Drive
Santa Ana, CA 92705
(714) 544-1918

Women in Illinois Needed Now (WIINN)

Contact: Senator Joyce Holmberg, Chair
P.O. Box 1555
Rockford, IL 61105
(815) 987-7555

Women in Psychology for Legislative Action

Contact: Noreen Johnson, Treasurer
13 Ashfield Street
Roslindale, MA 02131
(617) 471-2268

Women Organizing Women PAC (WOW PAC)

Contact: Barbara Pearce, Treasurer
P.O. Box 1652
New Haven, CT 06507-1652
(203) 281-3400

Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Jane Danowitz, Executive Director
120 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 544-4484

Women's Investment Network (WIN-PAC)

Contact: Jewel Lansing, President
3333 SW Arnold
Portland, OR 97219
(503) 246-6022

Women's Issue Network PAC

Contact: Donna Cordova, Treasurer
51 Warrenton Avenue
Hartford, CT 06105

Address may not be current.

Women's Political Action Committee of NJ

Contact: Patricia Connolly, President
P.O. Box 170
Edison, NJ 08818
(908) 638-6784

Women's Political Committee

Contacts: Marsha Kwalwasser, Co-chair
Marcia Herman, Treasurer
600 Hanley Way
Los Angeles, CA 90049
(213) 655-2711

Women's Political Fund

Contact: D.J. Soviero, Chair
P.O. Box 421811
San Francisco, CA 94142-1811
(415) 474-6808

A Challenge for Change: CAWP's Forum for Women State Legislators

The timing was extraordinary: a large national meeting for political women barely a month after Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas focused attention on the paucity of women in high public office. The result was a highly-charged atmosphere at CAWP's four-day national Forum for Women State Legislators, held in San Diego November 14-17, 1991.

The 1991 Forum marked the third time CAWP had invited *all* women state legislators to come together in San Diego. (The 1991 meeting was also the seventh CAWP-sponsored conference for women lawmakers.) These gatherings are part of CAWP's Program for Women State Legislators, a core project at the Center from its earliest days. In fact, the Forum also provided an occasion for celebrating CAWP's twentieth birthday and CAWP's work with elected women which has continued throughout those two decades.

Nine hundred officeholders and activists, journalists and scholars, corporate, foundation and union supporters, women leaders from abroad, and student interns met in plenaries and workshops, over meals and walking on the beach. They discussed everything from housing and homelessness to educational equity to AIDS to child care to term limitations.

Speakers included: Jewell Jackson McCabe, a founder of the Coalition of 100 Black Women; Connie Newman, director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Lena Guerrero, currently the first woman to chair (or even sit on) Texas' powerful Railroad Commission; and author Gail Sheehy and Dr. Nancy Snyderman of ABC News, who reported on the politics of women's health. A highlight was the roundtable discussion of sexual harassment and policymaking, featuring Professor Anita Hill and three other law professors; they provided the legislators with specific strategies for combatting sexual harassment and making the workplace safer for women.

On the opening night of the Forum, Ruth Mandel, director of CAWP, challenged those in attendance:

I challenge everyone to talk truth, to listen, to *hear* each other...and then to leave with a plan — a plan based on your conviction that change is necessary and desirable, your certainty that you count, and your personal commitment to use your leadership, your time in office, the public trust in you, to make a difference, to make even a bigger and better mark than you have so far, to leave your spot of earth a better place for your having been there. I'm tired of old-style dirty politics. I'm very tired of new-style nastiness, of negative politics as a first course of action. I'm tired of watching grandstanding and ego wars and cowardice. I'm tired of trying to figure out what someone really means or believes behind the rhetoric, the ambition, and the phoniness. I'm tired of going into my classrooms and trying to convince my students of the value of voting and participating in politics when they tell me it's hard for them to find political leaders to trust, to be inspired by, to believe in. If *you* — the political women, the builders and beneficiaries of this extraordinary era of change in women's lives — if *you* do not commit yourselves to using this gift of opportunity to move us all to a better way, who will ever do it?

I know that you *can* make a difference because, in the twenty years that the Center for the American Woman and Politics has been in existence, we've seen it time and time again. It

shows up in our research, which you'll hear about tomorrow morning when we report on our new data about the impact of women in public office. All of us can tell stories, stories like the one about the woman in statewide office who noticed how a new policy for state employees might unintentionally disrupt some workers' child care arrangements, or about the legislator who stopped her male colleagues before they could quietly repeal the state's rape shield law, or the collaboration of women in New Jersey government to create a women's studies chair at Rutgers, our state university.

We've *begun* to see the difference women leaders can make, but there are still so many places where we badly need a new type of leadership. We do need to combat the growing negativism in politics; we do need women to help restore trust in public officials, to counter the impulse that tells voters to throw out all the incumbents because, having been in office, they must by definition be unworthy of remaining there. We need women to put new issues on the agenda and to force to the forefront issues so badly in need of attention — issues like violence against women, both in this country and globally; the deteriorating world environment; the health concerns of women, children, and low-income people; and quality of life issues. All of these are major themes to be addressed here at the Forum. They are on the agenda because *you* have asked for them, because you notice the need for attention to them. That is already a step in the direction of making a difference. How many other major meetings of public officials and elected leaders address the problem of women and AIDS, or violence against women, or reaching female adolescents at risk, or women and the recession?

We may need women in political leadership for many good reasons, but I'm no longer shy about insisting that we need women most of all because women are different. Last summer, General Robert Barrow, a Marine commandant, illustrated brilliantly if unwittingly, in testimony before Congress, this society's need for women in the public arena. He argued *against* allowing

women in combat. He explained his opposition this way: "It's uncivilized," he said, "and women can't do it. Women give life, sustain life, nurture life — they can't take it." *His* reason for keeping women out is *our* reason for pushing more women in.

That was the biggest theme for the 1991 Forum for Women State Legislators — the need, the absolute necessity, for women's leadership. During the days that followed, women's leadership was very much in evidence, and the excitement generated by such an extraordinary gathering of leaders was palpable.

Tapes of all Forum sessions are available for purchase from Sound Images, Inc. (303-693-5511). Please see the enclosed order form for more information.

In retrospect, when we think about the Forum, two words spring to mind — "anger" and "connection." These dual threads wove through much of what we heard in San Diego. Jewell Jackson McCabe called for "boundary-crossing leadership," a leadership which connects us by overcoming differences such as race and class that have kept women apart. A panel of Congresswomen described the experience of being so few among so many and trying to make change. Lena Guerrero insisted that we demand places for *all* women at the table when decisions are made — and that we come to that table equipped to succeed. Anita Hill and her colleagues who reported on sexual harassment and policymaking elicited an electric, momentous, stunning and historic response. Throughout the Forum, energy was very high, sometimes the energy evoked by anger, frustration and even a sense of powerlessness — a sense that we women together see and know something, that we "get it," and do not yet control as much power and as many positions as we need to effect major change.

Nonetheless, we can and do connect with one another. The anger was *shared*...and so were so many other feelings and ideas. Women energized one another,

provided comfort and confirmation, urged each other to do and dare more. When a panelist asked how many in the audience of over 700 women had experienced sexual harassment, an astonishing 80% of the women present raised their hands! Here was dramatic evidence to underscore the view that women share distinctive life experiences which shape their responses to the world. Despite the miles and the differences in party and priorities that separate political women, they still have so much in common, so many points of connection. These points of connection can ignite the sparks of a force for long range progressive change which will benefit everyone. As Ruth Mandel commented in closing the Forum:

As we look back over the last four days, the themes we've hit tell us something about where we've come by 1991. I challenged you on the opening night to leave with a plan to make an even bigger difference; I hope many of you do have new plans and that they are enriched by some of the ideas and expertise we've all brought to each other.... We heard remarkable agreement and noted shared perspectives among our speakers. We did talk here about the progress we've made in two decades, but also about the barriers that remain and some new challenges that have sprung up.

But one message stands out: *We*, the women of this country, are defining a new agenda and talking about issues in ways they've never been talked about before. Before women began moving in large numbers into the public and political arenas, who talked about domestic violence? pay equity? date rape? family leave? sexual harassment? Women in public office are asking different questions and asking them of a different set of experts; they're coming up with new kinds of answers, too. We hope you've found some new tools and inspiration to carry that mission forward.

Building Women's Institutions

Ruth B. Mandel, Director, CAWP

At CAWP's 20th birthday celebration at the Forum for Women State Legislators, Ruth Mandel spoke about the need for the Campaign for CAWP. Her remarks are reprinted here.

I'd like to talk to you for a few minutes about *why* the Campaign for CAWP is so important to us. This is about institution building — about leaving something in place that survives all of us and continues to live and grow through the years.

In the past two decades, scholars (and women in general) have had to dig through the sands of time like a team of feminist archaeologists to reconstruct the history of women's lives and labors, to rediscover the ideas and the struggles and the people who constitute women's history. We have had to find a lost past in order to create a living, growing vital present moment of change for women.

I do not want our granddaughters and great-granddaughters to be faced with a similarly daunting task; I want them to have a legacy, a record of women's experience to trace where *we've* come from and connect it to where *they* want to go. I want what all of us have begun to last, to keep changing and becoming richer. Instead of facing the dark recesses of a hidden, lost history, I want future generations to know where they're picking up the threads of the fabric we're weaving, to see its rich colors and design, to feel connected to a women's culture and tradition, to feel pride in what we've shaped...and then to weave forward with their own shapes and hues and tones.

As one who has been working for most of my adult lifetime on a little piece of this modern history, I mourn what has already been lost — the programs, projects and organizations that were born in the late sixties and early seventies, but could not survive beyond institutional childhood because there were no resources to be found for their work. I'm determined that our Center should not meet that same fate...because what we do does matter. The Center for the American Woman and Politics is a vital resource, a national center for studying, documenting, analyzing and designing programs to address the issues all of us have been talking about these past few days. I don't have to convince anyone here about the vital need for women's leadership. But there is also a vital need (a *vital*, a life-sustaining need) for memory, for the structures that record and store memory. They keep the lifeblood flowing. Memory keeps past experience alive. Memory is the voice which whispers or screams, "Don't do that again!" Memory is the source of inspiration for a vision

of what might be. Memory tells us who we can become and where we can go. We maintain our knowledge of what has gone before, even as we extend our understanding with new research and thinking.

Unless we invest in our women's institutions, work like CAWP's will have been merely a special project of a hardy band of people over the span of a very few years. I honestly and deeply believe that we cannot afford to lose women's history again. And it's not only about history in our case at the Center for the American Woman and Politics. What we risk losing is all of the timely programs the Center conducts, our work with women public officials, making connections between elected women and people and ideas they need to know, our "future-building" educational programs for young women, our data bank storing information about the numbers and status of thousands of elected women, our up-to-date and informative fact sheets, our careful and thorough research. At the present time, all of this hangs on the tenuous thread of ad hoc fundraising.

So that's why my colleagues and I have made a commitment — a commitment to something we're calling the Campaign for CAWP. In the next few years, while we'll go on with the work we've been doing, our major project, our major passion, must be institution building. We must devote ourselves to building and securing the Center for the American Woman and Politics, the institution whose foundation we have laid over these past 20 years. *(If you would like to contribute to the Campaign, please use the enclosed envelope.)*

The Impact of Women in Public Office

Debra L. Dodson, Senior Research Associate, CAWP

For more information about this new series of reports, please see the enclosed booklet, The Impact of Women in Public Office: Findings at a Glance. The full reports — The Impact of Women in Public Office: An Overview; Reshaping the Agenda: Women in State Legislatures; Gender and Policymaking: Studies of Women in Office — are available from CAWP. See the last page of Findings at a Glance for an order form.

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) has been conducting research on women public officials in general, and women state legislators in particular, for two decades. By the mid-1980s, journalists and others who contacted the Center seeking information about women in politics were not only interested in finding out why so few women hold public office, but they were also beginning to ask us over and over again: "What difference do women in office make? Do they and their male colleagues care about different kinds of public policies? Are women changing the way that government operates?" Over the years, we heard individual political women's stories about how they made a difference, but we wanted to go beyond anecdotes to examine scientifically the ways in which female public officials might be having a distinctive impact.

Our research provides the first systematic examination of the gender impact question. With funding very generously provided by the Charles H. Revson Foundation, we adopted a two-pronged approach to answer the question: Do women in public office make a difference? First, we awarded grants to scholars across the country who conducted eleven different research projects aimed at providing an in-depth look at women's impact. Their projects examined elected and appointed women at different levels and in different branches of government and included studies of municipal officials, judges, cabinet appointees, and policymakers in the State and Defense Departments. Second, CAWP conducted an in-house study of women state legislators. In the summer of 1988, we surveyed by telephone large representative samples of women state legislators and their male colleagues. (For methodological information, please see the reports or the enclosed booklet, *The Impact of Women in Public Office: Findings at a Glance*.)

The results of the eleven CAWP-sponsored studies and CAWP's own national survey of legislators provide strong and compelling evidence that women in public office *do* make a difference and that they *do* have a distinctive impact.

CAWP's survey showed two ways in which women are bringing about change. First, women legislators are

slowly but surely reshaping the public policy agenda of legislatures. Elected women are working to make the agendas of legislative institutions more responsive to women's demands for equal rights as articulated by the contemporary women's movement and more reflective of women's concerns stemming from their roles as caregivers in the family and in society more generally. Second, women legislators are having an impact on the way government works. They are opening up the process and making it accessible to more and different groups of people.

One way to assess women officials' impact on public policy is to compare the priorities of legislators. A legislator's priorities tell us what is most important to her or him and indicate the policy areas that are likely to be affected because this individual holds public office. If women's priorities differ from those of their male colleagues, this would certainly be very strong evidence of women's distinctive impact.

We asked legislators to describe briefly the focus of the *single* bill that had been their own personal top priority in the most recent session. When we classified their priority bills into issue areas, we found three areas where women's and men's priorities were most likely to diverge. First, women were more likely than their male colleagues to have priorities dealing with children and family issues (11% vs. 3%). Second, women more frequently than men mentioned health care as their top priority (14% vs. 6%). Third, women were more likely than their male colleagues to have as their top priority a bill dealing with women's rights issues — issues such as domestic violence, insurance coverage for mammography, sexual harassment, the treatment of rape victims, and pay equity (10% vs. 4%).

Legislators are often concerned about other bills in addition to their single top legislative priority. When we asked legislators if during the current or most recent session they had worked on any bill which helped women in particular, the sizeable gender gap in policy concerns remained. Fifty-nine percent of the women, but only 36% of the men lawmakers said they had worked on bills dealing with women's rights.

Can women continue to make a difference as they move into leadership positions within governmental institutions? Some believe that only women who de-

emphasize their distinctive concerns as women make it into leadership. Others believe that once women attain leadership roles, they may feel greater pressure to conform to institutional norms and become "one of the boys." However, our research findings show that women who are in legislative leadership positions are just as likely (and in some cases more likely) than other women legislators to be reshaping the agenda through their legislative priorities and through their work on women's rights issues.

Of course women are not all alike, just as men differ among themselves. But when we compare women and men who share the same political characteristics — e.g., whether they are feminists, moderates, Republicans, or over fifty years old — the same pattern consistently occurs: women are more likely than their male colleagues to be reshaping the legislative agenda to reflect both women's traditional concerns as caregivers and their concerns as articulated by the contemporary women's rights movement. Women *are* making a difference.

We also found evidence that women's impact does not end with the policy agenda. Our research supports the belief that women are predisposed to connecting with citizens and to opening up the governmental process to public view — in short, to changing the way that government works. For example, we asked legislators to tell us who had been particularly helpful to them in working on their top priority bill. Women were more likely than men to say that citizens were very helpful, with 50% of women compared to only 36% of men saying that ordinary citizens were very helpful. Similarly, a majority of women and a sizeable minority of men agreed that women's increased presence has made a difference in the extent to which legislative business is conducted in public view rather than behind closed doors. In addition, majorities of both women and men believed that the increased presence of women in public office has affected the access of the economically disadvantaged to the legislative process.

Women clearly are reshaping the agenda and affecting the political process, even without large numbers of women in office. Although women are only 18% of state legislators, they are bringing to office the concerns and issues which are part of their life experiences. In order to get issues of special concern to women

addressed more fully, we need more women leaders inside government. Once they are there, CAWP's study suggests that they will help to enact public policy that better reflects the needs and concerns of all citizens.

Abortion Politics in Elections

Debra L. Dodson, Senior Research Associate, CAWP

The abortion issue is sure to be among the issues most talked about in the 1992 campaign season. The Supreme Court has agreed to review a Pennsylvania law restricting abortion access. Its ruling will probably be handed down just before the presidential nominating conventions. Whether or not the court explicitly addresses the status of *Roe v. Wade*, the decision could set the stage for abortion politics to play a critical role in the 1992 elections from the presidential level on down. The past may provide important clues to what the future holds for "pro-choice" and "pro-life" policy making.

Since 1989 when the Supreme Court rendered its decision in *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, CAWP has studied the impact of the abortion issue in gubernatorial and state legislative elections. (An executive summary of the most recent report is included with this mailing.) Our research, which has focused on four very different states (New Jersey, Virginia, Michigan, and Pennsylvania), goes beyond the simple questions of who won and who lost. The CAWP studies examine how the abortion issue affects what happens in the campaign season as well as voters' decisions on election day.

If the Supreme Court upholds the Pennsylvania abortion restrictions, the abortion issue will certainly be more important in the 1992 elections than it would have been otherwise. But *how* important it will be and who will benefit from its prominence will depend on a variety of factors discussed in CAWP's reports. Among the factors to consider are:

- The success in educating voters about differences between candidates: The Supreme Court decision will almost certainly heighten concern and interest in the abortion issue; but no matter how much the

topic of abortion policy is in the headlines, voters still have to be educated about where the candidates stand. Many voters may not know where candidates stand on the abortion issue, a fact ignored in the vast majority of exit polls. However, when candidates and activists actively work to educate the voters about the candidates' stands, voters are more knowledgeable. The challenge of educating voters is particularly great at the state legislative level, where campaigns receive less attention and voters are often less interested in following the campaign.

- The framing of the issue: How the abortion issue is framed affects how voters respond to the issue. The parental consent issue is a winner for the pro-life side, but when the abortion issue is discussed in terms of keeping government out of private decisions, the momentum swings to the pro-choice side. Beyond the battle for public opinion, the way the issue is framed also seems to affect the comfort of candidates and party activists with their position on the issue. Some pro-lifers interviewed felt uncomfortable discussing government limiting women's rights and giving more rights to the fetus, while the pro-choice activists and candidates felt comfortable discussing choices, but not necessarily the choices women might make under particular circumstances.
- The relative strength of the candidates: When a candidate's credibility or viability is questioned, voters who agree with that weaker candidate on the abortion issue and who see a difference between the candidates on the abortion issue are less likely to vote for the candidate with whom they agree on the issue. Candidates whose campaigns are seen as credible do a better job in maintaining support of those voters who agree with them on the abortion issue and who are aware of the candidates' stands on the abortion issue.

These findings and more are discussed in *Abortion Politics in State Elections: Comparisons across States* (1991) and *Election 1989: The Abortion Issue in New Jersey and Virginia* (1990). For more information about findings of the study, consult the enclosed executive summary from *Abortion Politics in State Elections*. Copies of the complete reports are available from CAWP; please see the order form attached to the enclosed executive summary.

The Next Generation of Women Leaders

In keeping with CAWP's major new efforts in the area of public leadership education for young women, we thought you might like to know about some of the programs to help develop the next generation of women leaders who will shape our public policies. We've included a report on National Education for Women's Leadership (NEW Leadership), CAWP's four-year Kellogg Foundation-funded program, along with some reflections from participants in our first summer institute. In addition, Suzanne Morse of the Kettering Foundation reminds us of why public leadership education is so important, and Marianne Alexander of the Public Leadership Education Network offers tips on finding and using student interns. We also describe programs related to young women and public leadership which other organizations have undertaken. One of our goals is to learn about as many such programs as possible, so we hope you'll be inspired to share with us any information you may have about similar activities.

CAWP's NEW Leadership Program: The First Year

Katherine E. Kleeman, Director,
NEW Leadership, CAWP

A portrait of today's public leaders would feature largely male, white faces. Because we want the picture of tomorrow's leaders to look much different, CAWP inaugurated the National Education for Women's Leadership (NEW Leadership) program during the summer of 1991.

Funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, NEW Leadership includes four summer institutes for college women as well as research on what kinds of programs already exist or should be undertaken to advance women's prospects for full and effective participation in public leadership. NEW Leadership is being conducted by CAWP in cooperation with the Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN), a consortium of women's colleges committed to developing public leadership education programs on their own campuses. Each year, six PLEN member colleges and six other institutions are selected for the program; they in turn choose two rising juniors and a faculty or staff advisor to represent them.

In June 1991, twenty-three students and their advisors from around the nation came to New Brunswick for the first ten-day institute. They discussed critical concepts, met both prominent and up-and-coming women leaders, and practiced leadership skills. They also planned year-

long projects that they are now conducting on their campuses or in their communities to further hone their leadership capacities. This summer these students will return to report on their projects and serve as mentors for the next class of NEW Leaders.

A hallmark of the program's first year was diversity. The students hailed from major cities and small towns across the country; more than a third were women of color. Their majors ranged from political science to English to biochemistry to architecture; their political inclinations were similarly varied. While few are currently planning careers in elective office, all plan to be actively involved in their communities, demonstrating the broad spectrum of public leadership possibilities. Many have already engaged in community service or political action.

Participating institutions in the first year of the program were: Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia; Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island; College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota; Douglass College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey; Lehman College, City University of New York, Bronx, New York; Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California; San Diego State University, San Diego, California; Stanford University, Palo Alto, California; Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri; Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Virginia; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas; Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

The research component of NEW Leadership is identifying public leadership education programs for

young women already underway and will consider where such programs might be implemented. We are surveying institutions around the country for information about their programs and activities and seeking out ideas at conferences and organization meetings. If you know of programs we should be including in our survey or places we might turn for ideas or information, please contact Deirdre Condit at CAWP.

PLEN, too, is conducting research in connection with NEW Leadership. The network has compiled a directory of public leadership internship opportunities in Washington, DC for college women, to be published shortly. PLEN will also be conducting a comprehensive survey of the public leadership education activities of its sixteen member colleges. PLEN's executive director, Marianne Alexander, is overseeing these projects in addition to participating in planning for the summer institutes.

Reflections on NEW Leadership Summer Institute: A Student's Perspective

Eleanor Brown, Biochemistry Student, Brown University

The moment I set foot in the Eagleton Institute on June 12, 1991 for the start of NEW Leadership, I realized it was going to be a memorable ten days. The first thing that struck me was the level of political sophistication among the student participants. There were women who had helped organize a boycott of classes to protest tuition increases at their university, women who had spearheaded the development of a networking organization for Mexican-American college women, and one woman in particular who seemed to have an incredible grasp of U.S. foreign policy. "These women are supposed to be my peers?" I remember asking myself. Initially, I couldn't help feeling intimidated.

As I thought of what to write about NEW Leadership, I decided to begin with my peers, because I was inspired not only by the achievements of the women who came to speak to us (and who undoubtedly made the way easier for my generation of leaders) but also by my peers. Any initial intimidation soon changed to

admiration. We were bright, motivated and eager to get involved. We exchanged ideas about leadership and community service projects that had been implemented at our various colleges until the early hours of the morning. Watch out! I feel that some future influential policymakers are among us!

I feel truly blessed to have had the opportunity to listen to and rap with such an incredible collection of speakers. Some of the speakers were individuals whom I had idolized from afar, hoping that some day I'd have the opportunity to shake a hand. I was able to spend entire evenings with individuals like Shirley Chisholm and Bella Abzug, asking questions I had always wanted to ask. There were also much younger women, some having recently graduated from college, discussing their experiences working with politicians and running for office. These sessions in particular were real confidence-builders for me; somehow achievements seemed more within reach when the person speaking was only two or three years older than I am. The skills we discussed were very practical; there were sessions on public speaking, lobbying, and fundraising. And we definitely covered a very broad spectrum of leaders. Politicians came to speak, but so did environmentalists, city managers and educators. I found that each speaker made very definite suggestions, giving specific examples of strategies she had found useful and pitfalls to avoid.

I had attended conferences like these before in high school and often heard words like "networking" mentioned. But I now realize that I never quite understood how to go about "networking" before NEW Leadership. I left CAWP having "networked." As I heard speakers describe how they had progressed in their fields, I learned not only about resources but also about how to use them. For example, I had always known I was interested in managing campaigns. I left CAWP with concrete ideas about how to pursue my interest; I knew I should contact individuals like Maura Brueger of Washington, D.C. and Betsey Wright of Arkansas, and I also knew what types of internships and programs I should be thinking about. I even committed myself to working on a fellow participant's campaign for state office!

And then there were the well-needed reality checks. One in particular stands out in my mind. After nine days of meeting so many women who "had made it" and were

willing to help us "make it" too, I was in seventh heaven. Even though nearly every speaker had reiterated the strong personal sacrifices she had made for the sake of her career, the seriousness of this point still had not registered in my mind. But on the final day there was one speaker in particular who spoke of how her determination to implement needed change had been to the detriment of her health. Somehow I saw myself in that woman. The need for balance had finally struck me.

To my mind the NEW Leadership program was as practical as it could have been. Every attempt was made to make us aware of the obstacles we should anticipate as individuals new to politics and as women in particular. In addition, ideas were constantly being challenged, since we were women of varied backgrounds and different ideologies. Nevertheless, we were all women, all committed to the idea that women need to become more involved in decision-making processes. For this reason, it was an encouraging, nurturing environment.

The moment I left CAWP, that was no longer true. I was reminded of that when a woman in the train station on my way home from the conference asked me what the badge on my shirt saying "50/50 by 2000" meant. When I explained that it referred to the campaign for gender equality in legislative bodies, she replied that it always amused her to meet idealistic college students. I guess one could say I was "back in the real world."

What has been most positive for me is the impact NEW Leadership has had on my thinking and behavior "back in the real world." I returned to Rhode Island to the delightful news that a package of civil rights bills I had helped work on had been signed into law. But one week later the president nominated Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court, and I couldn't help wondering whether all our affirmative action gains (not to mention *Roe v. Wade*) were about to go through the window. But in the face of a national political climate that has been very discouraging and individuals who find me at best "idealistic," I've been even more motivated and I've been working harder. Ten days with an incredible group of women obviously had an impact on me. I think this has also been reflected in the energy my partner in the program from Brown University and I have channeled into implementing our project this summer. And one of the fundamental themes of our project is "women

empowering women." Because to our minds, that's exactly what NEW Leadership was about.

Reflections on NEW Leadership Summer Institute: An Advisor's View

Helen Beckstrom, Director, Women and Gender
Studies, Sweet Briar College

This article is excerpted from a speech Helen Beckstrom delivered at Sweet Briar's orientation last fall.

When the faculty advisors arrived, the students had been together at the institute for four days. They had heard lectures on leadership, examined their own leadership styles, gone to New York City to meet with women political leaders, and learned something about their diversity. That — learning about their diversity — meant facing some conflicts. In fact, there had been a major protest over the way in which one speaker had presented the history of the women's movement. Because of this, over the course of the week we abandoned parts of the original agenda, which was to have focused on grooming women for political leadership, to give us time to deal with the differences and conflicts within the group. The changed agenda enabled us to look, perhaps more realistically than originally planned, at what it might mean for a woman to be a leader in the late twentieth century.

The first evening an image consultant spoke. She spoke about speaking — and about her life as a consultant. (In fact, each of the women who came as experts gave insights into their lives and careers.) Then each student was asked to each give a two minute extemporaneous speech on something she felt passionate about, trying to convey that passion to the audience. There were talks on baby sitting, on U.S. policy in the third world, on ice skating, on the rights of minority women — passions all.

The week was incredible. We had workshops on diversity, lectures on leadership, panel discussions by women in political offices. We met political consultants, scholars, politicians, educators. Most of the speakers

were women; a few were men. Many were prominent. They represented minority and majority in person and in opinion. (Race and sexual orientation varied.) All were as passionate as the students had been that first night. Each described days more full than most college professors' worst nightmares of overcommitment. Then, when the advisors collapsed exhausted, the students continued discussing, arguing, and partying into the early morning — only to begin again the next day.

The week was well-organized and our needs were well met, but it was chaotic and the chaos was inescapable. You could find a room to escape to, but no time to go there. There were more issues than could be addressed in a lifetime, let alone a week. The energy was palpable. It was inescapable because the issues, the urgency, the energy are part of what the world is about these days. That week at CAWP we came face to face with the demands of diversity in a time of enormous social change, not only in the United States but worldwide.

What then does it mean for a woman to be a leader in the late twentieth century? It is not being class president, the captain of the team, a CEO. In this (traditional) view, leadership is hierarchical, with few leaders and many followers. What I learned this summer, however, was a new view of leadership where leaders seek to increase the responsibility, ability to care, power, fairness and freedom in themselves and others. I learned that, in a changing world, we need leaders who are brave enough to abandon hierarchy for the new view of leadership. It is not easy to abandon hierarchy and listen to others unless you know who you are. This is why leadership begins by knowing who you are. It is also the reason why knowing who you are is only the beginning.

Women and Public Leadership: The Missing Piece

Suzanne W. Morse, Director of Programs,
Kettering Foundation

As we move toward the 21st century and the third millennium, a question surrounds us daily: What will the world be like?

The one assurance is that it will be different than we think. Even the best prognosticators did not predict the swift fall of the Eastern Bloc. What is needed in this changing world is a model of participating and acting in the public world that seeks to solve problems, no matter the party in control or the leadership in place. The "new" public leader will draw on the strengths of the past — that is, a governing system that included people, that relied on people. Governments cannot solve all problems. The solutions require the best and brightest of the citizenry as well.

Our "new" leaders will also look different from the traditional models. They will include more women, people of color, and all socio-economic groups. Why? Old ways of solving problems do not work. The new century needs a full cadre of men and women of all colors and creeds working together to have a real chance of tackling some of the nation's and the world's problems.

Unfortunately, most of the problems we face cannot wait for yet another national study. Children are growing up, the elderly are suffering, and economic effects of a recession or downturn stay with individuals for years. The public leader needed for the future must embrace the concepts of participation, involvement, but also urgency to garner the country's talents quickly. Where are these leaders?

The work on leadership styles put forth by Carol Gilligan and Lawrence Kohlberg gives some answers. What is known from their separate but related research is that women tend to bring to leadership a sense of relationship and the value of interactions. Men tend to bring a sense of fairness, moral justice, and equity. Neither is right or wrong; they are simply different.

The rapidly changing world order suggests that the approach to problem-solving, whether between nations or communities, needs something more than it has had in the past. I contend that the missing piece is the leadership perspective now attributed to women. Women have different lenses for viewing the world. The leadership approach that must be created embraces both the male and female models but needs a clear, almost pristine balance to be most effective. The women (and men) of this generation of students have the unique opportunity to strike that balance and realize that old

ways of doing public business need rethinking. Women have a crucial role to play in this redefinition.

How will our reinvigoration of public leadership begin? By thinking together about the changing world and what works in getting things done. That requires men and women working together to define a new paradigm of getting the job done. It is sorting out what approaches to public leadership are most effective and then testing those assumptions by taking on problems in the community or organization that need attention. It means including people who have not traditionally been a part of problem solving because of their color or social or organizational standing. The objective is to frame the issues we face as *our* own issues and not someone else's.

As we think about the future, it is critical that we take advantage of all the leadership skills and perspectives available. To paraphrase William James, the leadership challenge for the next century is to find the music within us. Including women is the key.

How — and Why — to Recruit a Female Intern

Marianne Alexander, Executive Director,
Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN)

While these suggestions might seem to apply most directly to a woman officeholder, they are also valuable to others who would like to find and use interns. Moreover, faculty members who are helping students to secure internships may find useful ideas for making their case to public officials. PLEN is a consortium of women's colleges working together to prepare women for public leadership: PLEN, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Ever wish for another pair of hands to manage your constituent correspondence, track legislation, or find an important fact to support your position on an issue? Do you sometimes need an extra set of eyes and ears to monitor an important meeting when your presence is required elsewhere? Have you longed for the luxury of an assistant who could delve deeply into an issue that is important to the community you serve?

If you answered "yes" to any of these questions, you could use the help of a woman student enrolled at a college near you! As an intern working in your office, she could earn college credit for the experience. She probably would not expect to get paid. What she *will* gain is the opportunity to observe first hand the public policy process and the broad range of responsibilities exercised by public leaders like you.

How do you find the right intern for you? Contact the office of career services and/or the political science or women's studies departments at a nearby college. Send a description of the internship you are offering so prospective interns will know what you expect. Include a paragraph about the duties you would like an intern to perform and the number of hours required. Describe the kind of skills that will be needed to do the job. You should also mention some of the issues of particular interest to you. Ask applicants to submit a resume, a writing sample and a cover letter. The writing sample is important if you want to select a student who can write to your constituents or prepare brief reports about meetings she attends on your behalf.

If your intern is recruited by early fall to begin a four-month stint in January, she may be able to arrange her class schedule to give you as much as two or three days a week during the spring semester. Or she could work several days a week in the summer or during her January break.

What can an intern learn from working with you? If you ask her to track legislation, she will have a greater understanding of how the lawmaking process really works. If you ask her to prepare a policy brief, she will have the experience of gathering information and preparing it in a succinct and easily digestible form. If she reads and answers your mail, she will have a clearer picture of the problems confronting the average citizen. Sometimes a student can fulfill a research paper requirement for her college at the same time she prepares a background paper on an important issue for you.

The most valuable lesson a student can learn from you is how one woman can make a difference in the public policy arena. You will be teaching her, through your example, how a woman leader uses her talents and skills to improve the lives of citizens.

To get the most from your intern and at the same time serve as a role model, you will have to spend some time with her. An investment of your time early in the process will ensure that the intern understands her responsibilities and feels comfortable enough with you to ask questions; the payoff will come in her ability to do a better job for you. You may find it worthwhile to invite her to go with you to an important meeting to observe you in action.

If you are concerned that you may be *too* busy for an intern, consider this: by sponsoring an intern, you will be helping to prepare a young woman for a leadership career in politics. While you are receiving valuable help in your office, you will be helping to recruit a new generation of women ready to fill leadership roles in the public arena.

Young Women and Public Leadership: Organizations Taking Action

In preparation for this edition of CAWP News and Notes, we wrote to a number of national organizations for women and girls to see if they have undertaken programs aimed at encouraging young women to become educated about and involved in public leadership. Below is a compilation of our findings to date; we would very much welcome additional information from other organizations. (We reported on CAWP's NEW Leadership activities earlier in this issue and have previously highlighted the Public Leadership Education Network.)

Center for Women Policy Studies (CWPS): The Feminist Futures Project

The following was excerpted from a CWPS release.

The Feminist Futures Project of the Center for Women Policy Studies has been an ongoing effort to identify, listen to and incorporate the views and voices of young women into policy debates, particularly within the women's movement.

The first step of the project was a national conference by, for and about women in their 20s which was held in 1989 in Washington, D.C.. Entitled "Feminist Futures," this conference brought together nearly 500 young women of different backgrounds and perspectives who were concerned with "the feminist agenda" — both its strengths and its failings. Critical issues of race, class, sexual orientation and physical ability became central points of discussion against a backdrop of seminars on a range of issues including "Transforming the Workplace," "The Politics of Women and AIDS," "Women's Health and Reproductive Freedom: Choice and Control," and "Violence Against Women: Confronting Rape, Date Rape and Domestic Violence." A report on the Feminist Futures conference is available from CWPS. In addition to recording conference events, the report presents the concerns which were voiced by young women at the conference; it is an attempt both to contribute to the "remembering" of women's history and also to outline some of the unique policy perspectives of this generation of women.

Another part of the Feminist Futures project is a quarterly newsletter, *Sisterline*. This publication, focusing on younger women, provides information and updates on woman-focused events and opportunities, and is a tool for feminist organizing. *Sisterline* is an interactive newsletter providing a forum for communication between young women and within and between different communities of young women. Submissions to the newsletter are encouraged. Please send information about groups or events of interest to: *Sisterline*, Center for Women Policy Studies, 2000 P Street NW, Suite 508, Washington, DC 20036.

National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC): Young Participant Perspectives on the Twentieth Anniversary Convention

Lisa Kaenzig and Denise Morrell, who authored the following, are Douglass College students and members of the college's NWPC chapter.

The twentieth anniversary convention of the National Women's Political Caucus, held in Washington, D.C. in July of 1991, proved to be more than a meeting of the individual and state chapters with the Executive Board. It was a coming together of the origins and aims, the

past and present, of the women's movement. As newcomers to the NWPC, we felt immeasurable strength and honor to be in the same room with women whose names have accompanied the milestones of challenged history. While growing up, we watched from afar these same women who have dedicated their tremendous energies to making the power of women a steady part of the scenery, instead of occasional distance markers. We have listened to these women try to make *firefighter*, *police officer*, and *first-year student* (instead of freshman) part of everyday language, rather than freaks of media or academia.

Although these invaluable individuals do not necessarily agree on particular methods of achieving empowerment for women, they spoke as one during the convention about one theme: our journey is far from over, and in order to go the distance, new strength and leadership are necessary. In recognition of the relatively recent realization that young women are essential to the successful future of the journey to justice, this year's biennial convention offered the Young Women's Forum.

The Young Women's Forum, organized by NWPC's 1991 interns, highlighted ways of becoming involved and informed about politics, including internships, public service, educational and career opportunities. A panel workshop for career planning provided information on effective paths to these goals. As a follow-up to the NWPC's Capitol Hill legislative briefing and lobbying day, the Young Women's Forum presented an excellent training session for subsequent congressional lobbying, given by United States Student Association president Selena Dong. Unfortunately, the Young Women's Forum programs often coincided with key events of the entire convention. If nothing else, these occasions provided private lessons in evaluating choices.

From the Forum formally arose the Young Women's Caucus (YWC), a special interest group of the NWPC. It is a forum for young women who are interested in becoming involved in politics and women's issues. As part of the NWPC, we are a multi-partisan, pro-choice group whose purpose is to increase the number of women elected and appointed to office. This purpose can be fulfilled through the Young Women's Caucus by motivating young women to get involved in politics at an early age by providing them with mentoring and

networking opportunities, training sessions, and a forum for dialogue. As part of the Young Women's Caucus, members will be active in the planning of events and development of plans for this reactivated special interest group.

Although the newly-formed YWC left the convention without a formal foundation in the form of bylaws or a constitution, an Executive Board was established and members elected. The specific offices were clearly designed to promote and accomplish the Caucus' stated goals — Fundraiser, Budgeting Officer, Resume Bank Coordinator, Mentoring Program Director, Membership and Outreach Coordinator, Diversity Coordinator — all are overseen by the Executive Director.

Preparing to pick up the torch and continue the journey, the Young Women's Caucus is open to ideas, assistance and a growing membership.

National Women's Political Caucus: Young Women's Caucus Reactivates

The following was excerpted from an article in the Women's Political Times written by Leigh Dyer, a Young Women's Caucus (YWC) member and senior at Duke University.

Newly elected officers of the revitalized YWC are keeping momentum going by setting up a national membership recruitment and fundraising system. They have already established a resume bank to match young women with political campaigns and are working to expand the program into the private sector. They are also planning a series of campaign trainings geared toward young women and mentoring programs to match experienced NWPC members with new YWC members. One particular focus of the YWC will be to ensure that it truly represents all of the diverse groups and political perspectives of today's young women. In the words of Jennifer Gorman, co-chair of the YWC, "We need to come together as a national community of young women. We can empower ourselves to make a difference for the future." For more information, call Jennifer Gorman, YWC Executive Board Co-Chair, (202) 488-2039 or write to YWC, c/o National Women's Political Caucus, 1275 K Street NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005.

Women's Global Leadership Institute: Petition Drive Continues

Charlotte Bunch, Director
Niamh Reilly, Program Associate
Center for Women's Global Leadership,
Douglass College, Rutgers University

On March 13, 1992, an international coalition of women's groups presented petitions with more than 75,000 signatures — representing 78 countries and 12 languages — to the United Nations Secretary General, calling upon the 1993 United Nations World Conference on Human Rights to bring violations of women's human rights to the center of the conference agenda. The petition drive grew out of strategies developed by participants in the first Women's Global Leadership Institute, convened in June 1991 by the Center for Women's Global Leadership at Rutgers University.

Twenty-three women working to end gender violence in their regions and countries participated in the Institute. They represented women's leadership at the grass roots, in public policymaking, and in the judiciary from Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East, Western and Eastern Europe, the Pacific, and North America.

The twelve days of the Institute included panels, workshops and public events exploring ways to make women's perspectives on gender violence more prominent and powerful in public policy debates. Panels with outside resource people were held on such topics as "Gender Violence, Development, Militarism and the State," "Race, Culture, Religion and Family in Relation to Violence Against Women," "Women's Health and Sexuality," and "The Strategic Role of Human Rights and International Law in Addressing Gender Violence." Working groups then developed coordinated international and local strategies for combatting violence in relation to five areas: human rights, development, health, education, and the law. At the end of the institute, participants reported on their conclusions at the International Women's Tribune Centre in New York to women working in human rights, development, and

women's organizations in the U.S. and to representatives from the U.N. and funding agencies.

As one of the strategies developed by the working groups, the participants launched a coordinated global campaign of sixteen days of activism against gender violence with the slogan "Violence Against Women Violates Human Rights." The campaign ran from November 25 (The International Day of Protest Against Violence Against Women, originated in Latin America) to December 10 (Human Rights Day); during this period, each Institute participant coordinated a special event or series of events in her region. Groups around the world were encouraged to do so as well. It was during the campaign that the petition drive was launched by the Global Center.

The Global Center will hold its second Women's Global Leadership Institute from June 14-27, 1992 at Douglass College. There will be two events open to the public during that time, one in New Jersey and one in New York. For more information about the summer institute, contact Susana Fried, Coordinator, Women's Global Leadership Institute, 27 Clifton Avenue, Douglass College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903, (908) 932-8782.

The Global Center hopes to present twice as many signatures to the U.N. in September — if you'd like to see the U.N. World Conference on Human Rights include women's rights as human rights, see the enclosed petition.

Women's Legislative Caucuses: An Update

Lisa Kaenzig, Student Intern, CAWP

Below is a directory of women's caucuses in state legislatures including the name of the contact person and a brief description of the caucuses' membership, structure and interests (if we received a response to our survey). Since this information was compiled in mid-1991, the number of women serving in some states has changed. If you know of additional women's legislative caucuses which are not listed here, please contact Lucy Baruch or Debbie Walsh.

National State Legislative Organizations

We will report on the activities of the national organizations of women state legislators in the next issue of *CAWP News and Notes*.

National Order of Black Elected Legislative Women (NOBEL/Women)

Contact: Holly Mitchell
Office of Senator Diane Watson
4401 Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90043
(916) 445-5215

Senator Diane Watson (CA), President

National Order of Women Legislators (NOWL)

Contact: Joyce Hearn, President
1300 Berkeley Road
Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 734-0480

Women's Network of the National Conference of State Legislatures

Contact: Sue Mullins, Executive Director
RR One, Box 49
Corwith, IA 50430
(515) 583-2156

Representative Jo Ann Pottorff (KS), Chair
Senator Paula Hollinger (MD), Vice Chair
Annette Durlam, NCSL Staff Liaison

State Legislative Caucuses

Women Legislators of Arkansas

Contact: Senator Charlie Cole Chaffin
12180 I-30
Benton, AR 72015
(501) 778-5636

The Women Legislators of Arkansas were a united group of ten for the first time in 1991; they held regularly scheduled meetings with majority attendance at each one. The caucus spends most of its time working to defeat legislation that it perceives as potentially harmful to the women of Arkansas. The issues the Caucus focused on in 1991 included divorce counseling requirements and education. The caucus plans to seek out legislation that they can sponsor and work to pass in order to make their mark in the Arkansas legislature.

California Women Legislators

Contact: Anne Marie Shanks
c/o Assemblywoman Jackie Speier
State Capitol, Room 4140
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-8020

Assemblywoman Jackie Speier, Chair
Senator Marian Bergeson, Vice Chair

The California Women Legislators have monthly meetings during the session and count all 22 women members of the Assembly and Senate as members. Staff for the caucus comes from the chair's office and from other members' offices when necessary. The group plans to hold monthly dinners and joint activities with women lobbyists and women in the capital press. Issues the caucus focused on in 1991 included:

- women incarcerated for killing their abusers
- availability and use of Norplant
- child care licensing and standards
- sexual harassment in the workplace
- teen pregnancy and child support
- rape education
- breast cancer
- sex crimes
- board and commission appointments.

Connecticut Order of Women Legislators (OWLS)

Contact: Representative Mary G. Fritz
43 Grove Street
Yalesville, CT 06492
Representative Mary G. Fritz, President
Representative Josephine Fuchs, 1st Vice President

The Connecticut OWLS meet on an ad hoc basis during the legislative session. Of the 43 female members of the Connecticut legislature, 40 belong to OWLS. Members pay \$5.00 dues for a two year membership. The president's staff assists the caucus. The OWLS have focused on issues surrounding crimes against women including incest, sexual abuse, and domestic violence. The OWLS plan to take a new direction, addressing problems not previously considered, such as the spending methods of the state.

State of Hawaii Senate Women's Caucus

Contact: Senator Ann Kobayashi
235 S. Beretania Street
Room 503
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 586-6750

The Senate Women's Caucus counts all seven women members of the Senate as members. The caucus meets informally on an ad hoc basis during the session and frequently meets jointly with the House Women's Caucus. The Caucus has no elected leaders and makes decisions as a group. There are no dues or funding except for the use of individual members' staffs. The Caucus divides its efforts among several issues. In 1991 these included:

- domestic violence
- sexual assault
- child care
- family leave
- auto insurance.

In the coming year, the Caucus plans to expand to include issues related to funding for social services and employment. In January of 1992, the Caucus will sponsor its second Crimes Against Women rally on the second day of the session in order to highlight a Caucus-sponsored package of bills related to these issues.

State of Hawaii House Women's Caucus

Contact: Representative Rosalyn Baker
State Capitol, Room 311
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 548-7847

The House Women's Caucus consists of all 14 female members of the Hawaii House of Representatives. The caucus was founded in 1989, and meets on an ad hoc basis. Most members attend all meetings. The caucus receives no dues or legislative funding. Staff support is provided by caucus members' personal staffs. Issues the caucus is focusing on presently include domestic violence programs and crimes against women. The caucus plans to expand to encompass a wider variety of women's concerns.

Illinois Council of Women Legislators

Contact: Teresa Preston or Kelly McCarthy
Stratton Office Building, Room 1105
Springfield, IL 62706
(217) 782-4040

Representative Suzanne Duechler, Chair
Representative Mary Flowers, Vice Chair

The Illinois Council of Women Legislators meets twelve times per year on an issue-by-issue basis. Of the 28 women members of the Illinois legislature, 27 belong to the caucus. The only form of funding the caucus receives is membership dues. The caucus has three volunteer staff members. The caucus is currently focusing on day care, women's prison reform, family leave, and public aid, dividing their efforts evenly among these issues.

Legislative Women (Iowa)

Contact: Senator Elaine Szymoniak
State Capitol
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-3371 or (515) 281-5307

Legislative Women counts 18 of the 23 women in the Iowa legislature as members. The caucus meets on an irregular basis, but meetings are very well attended. There is no support staff or official leadership, but most caucus members are committee chairs or ranking members. The caucus plans a biennial event over a summer weekend.

Louisiana Women's Legislative Caucus

Contact: Senator Diana E. Bajoie, Chair
PO Box 15168
New Orleans, LA 70175
(504) 568-7760

The Caucus consists of the four women in Louisiana's legislature. As a caucus, they are provided with an office which is staffed during the legislative session; additional funding comes from donations. The group deals with a limited number of issues; this year, they worked on a bill mandating insurance coverage for mammography and pap smears, which was ultimately enacted. The Caucus also co-sponsored a three-day conference with the Governor's office; more than 900 women from around the state attended to discuss several issues. Out of this meeting, a new group of women promoting women in elective office has been created. There are plans for another similar conference next year.

Women Legislators of Maryland

Contact: Teddi Schulman
Executive Director
6 Bladen Boulevard
200 Lowe House Office Bldg.
Annapolis, MD 21401
(301) 841-3013

Senator Barbara Hoffman, President
Delegate Sheila Hixson, President-Elect
Delegate Betty Workman, 1st Vice President

The Women Legislators of Maryland count all 44 women members of the Maryland legislature as members and meet once a week during the three-month session and on an ad hoc basis during the interim. The group holds one fundraiser per year and members pay \$100 dues each year. The caucus holds an annual retreat in October, during which members discuss legislative priorities for the upcoming session. The legislators divide their time between research on issues and lobbying for bills they support. Issues on which the Caucus focused in 1990-1991 included:

- women's and children's health
- battered spouse syndrome
- reproductive rights.

Massachusetts Caucus of Women Legislators

Contact: Barbara J. Talkov
Executive Director
Room 156, State House
Boston, MA 02133
(617) 722-2266

The Massachusetts Caucus of Women Legislators was founded in 1975. It consists of women from both the House and Senate. Out of the 38 women serving in the legislature, 31 are members of the caucus, paying \$35 in dues per year. The caucus receives additional funding for administrative and staff purposes from the Speaker. Staff consists both of paid employees and student interns. The caucus meets on an ad hoc basis as issues arise. The caucus' activity is focused in large part on budgetary issues due to the state's current economic problems.

Women of the Mississippi Legislature

Contact: Representative Miriam Q. Simmons
45 Old Highway 98E
Columbia, MS 39429
(601) 736-4028

The Mississippi Legislative Women's Caucus was founded in 1988 and includes all 12 women members of the legislature. The caucus is on call during the legislative session and meets informally as a group. Due to problems created by redistricting at the current time, the Caucus is restricted in what it is able to accomplish.

Legislative Women's Caucus, Inc. of New York State

Contact: Devra Nusbaum, Director
Legislative Office Building, Room 539A
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-4347

Assemblywoman Catherine T. Nolan, Chair
Senator Ada Smith, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Nettie Mayersohn, Vice Chair

The Legislative Women's Caucus counts all 28 women members of the House and Senate as members. The caucus meets regularly when the legislature is in session. The Caucus' top priority is developing

information and resources among women and women's groups in order to advocate effectively for legislation on important issues. The caucus is funded by a combination of membership dues (\$50 per year) and funding from the Democratic Assembly Majority, though the caucus comprises both Democrats and Republicans from both houses. There are two paid staff members. The goals of the Caucus are to develop legislation and hold a conference on legislative issues.

North Carolina Legislative Women's Caucus

Contact: Representative Bertha "B" Holt, Chair
640 Legislative Office Building
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-5858

The North Carolina Legislative Women's Caucus counts all 24 of the North Carolina women legislators as members. The caucus has no staff support and receives its funding solely from dues. The caucus holds meetings once a month, and most members attend regularly. Issues the caucus is focusing on include appropriations for education, environmental concerns and health issues with a special focus on insurance coverage for mammograms and pap smears.

Women Legislators of Oregon

Contact: Representative Lisa Naito
State Capitol, Room 365
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-8029

The Women Legislators of Oregon meet informally and are open to both female and male legislators and any interested staff. The caucus was convened in 1979 and meets on an ad hoc basis during the biennial legislative sessions, with irregular attendance. The caucus receives no funding and has no dues; the members' staffs serve as volunteer aides for the group. The caucus focuses its attention on lobbying around a few issues including teen pregnancy and clinics, early childhood education, and family support legislation.

Rhode Island Caucus of Women State Legislators

Contact: Representative Linda Kushner
560 Lloyd Avenue
Providence, RI 02906
(401) 831-377

Texas Women's Legislative Caucus

Contact: Representative Sherri Greenberg
House of Representatives
PO Box 2910
Room G-54
Austin, TX 78768-2910
(512) 463-0700

Virginia Women's Round Table

Contact: Representative Mary A. Marshall
2256 North Wakefield Street
Arlington, VA 22207
703-528-1710

The Women's Round Table serves as a forum for information on women's legislation. It does not lobby, debate or research. The Round Table is open to all members of the legislature, both men and women. It meets weekly during the legislative session; once in the early fall and again in December for a pre-legislative session meeting. The Round Table has no dues, but subscriptions to the weekly Women's Round Table summary from the Virginia League of Women Voters are \$15 a year. The caucus has two paid staff members and the sponsor, Representative Mary Marshall, contributes money to compile the weekly legislative summary and spread sheet.

Women's Legislative Caucus (West Virginia)

Contact: Senator Sondra Lucht
1013 Mill Race Drive
Martinsburg, WV 25401
(304) 263-2756

The Women's Legislative Caucus was formed in 1982 and meets informally on a weekly basis during sessions of the legislature. Most of the women in the West Virginia legislature are active members of the Caucus and meetings are fairly well attended. The Caucus has no dues and receives no funding, relying on the individual members' staffs for support. The Caucus evenly divides its time among issues such as prenatal care and day care, and has been successful lobbying on behalf of these issues. The Caucus serves as a support group for the women legislators to help them stay well-informed on issues and lobby for those issues that affect women in their state.

**Know others who might be interested in
CAWP's Subscriber Information Service (SIS)?**

Please pass on this form.

_____ Please enroll me in SIS; enclosed is \$20 for a one year subscription. SIS subscribers receive three packets, each of which includes: *CAWP News & Notes*; fact sheets; reports; reprints of articles; and other timely information. All subscriptions must be prepaid; please make checks payable to CAWP.

_____ Enclosed is a _____ tax deductible contribution to CAWP.

Name & Title _____

Organization/Company (if applicable) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901 • (908) 828-2210
